National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. X.---NO. 50. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 518.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS.
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS BROTHERS, PRINTERS.

Selections.

SPEECH
OF
S. P. CHASE, OF OHIO,

In the Senate of the United States, March 26-7, 1850.

On the Compromise Resolutions submitted by Mr. Clay, on the 25th of January.

Mr. Chase said:

I rise, Mr. President, with unaffected diffidence, to offer to the Senate my views of the important questions presented by the resolutions of the honorable Senator from Kentucky.

Coming from the private walks of life, without the advantage of previous public position, and without experience in legislative debate, I speak from no eminence which will entitle me to command attention. I claim for what I say that consideration only which is due to sincerity of belief, to directness of purpose, and to whatever force of argument I may be able to bring to the support of my positions.

It has been said, Mr. President, and said in a tone of complaint, by southern gentlemen, that this Government is rapidly becoming a mere Government of the majority—becoming a great consolidated democracy. Now, sir, if by this it be meant that this Government of ours has become, or is to become, a Government of the American people, administered in conformity with the will of a majority of the people—if it be meant that the democratic principle is carried, or is likely to be carried, into practical application in its administration and legislation, I see in the fact, if fact it be, no ground of complaint, but rather ground of congratulation and satisfaction. Why, sir, what is this democratic principle? Equality of natural rights, guarantied and secured to all, by the laws of a just popular Government. For one, I desire to see that principle applied to every subject of legislation, no matter what that subject may be—to the great question involved in the resolutions now before the Senate, and to every other question.

But our responsibilities are limited by our powers: and however clear it may be that we are bound by allegiance to democratic principle to condemn, to mitigate, to abolish slavery wherever we can constitutionally do so, it is equally clear that we are not bound, and that we have no right to interfere with slavery by legislation beyond the sphere of our constitutional powers.

We have no power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the States. We have power to prevent its extension, and to prohibit its existence within the sphere of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government. Our duty, therefore, is to abstain from interference with it in the States. It is also our duty to prohibit its extension into national territories, and its continuance where we are constitutionally responsible for its existence.

Such, Mr. President, is my position; and for the purpose of showing that I am sustained in it by the very highest authority, I propose to review, somewhat at large, the history of this Government in its relations to slavery.

It was said yesterday by the honorable Senator from Virginia [Mr. Hunter] that the South had no cause of complaint against the North in regard to slavery until the year 1820, the date of the Missouri compromise. However that may be, we must go further back in time, if we wish to trace the controversy between slavery and freedom in this country to its source. We must go two hundred years further back. It was in 1620 that a Dutch ship ascended the James river, bringing the first slaves into Virginia. In that same year the Mayflower brought the Pilgrim founders of New England to Plymouth Rock. Slavery was introduced into Virginia. Freedom was planted in New England. The contest between the despotic principle—the element and guaranty of slavery—and the democratic principle—the element and guaranty of liberty—commenced.

But slavery was not established in Virginia without remonstance and resistance. The colonists complained vehemently of the introduction of slaves, and resorted to various expedients of prevention.—But the desire of the mother country to benefit the navigator, and to stimulate production, led the British Government to disregard every complaint, and to negative all colonial legislation against the slave trade. Slaves continued to be imported. The traffic extended to other colonies, until at length slavery obtained a foothold in every one of them. At the breaking out of the Revolution, slaves were held in every colony, from Massachusetts to Georgia.

Well, sir, how was slavery regarded at that period? In September, 1774, the first Congress of the colonies met in Philadelphia. Had the opposition to Slavery, which had been previously manifested, and the desire for its extinction which had been so generally cherished, now become extinct? A decisive answer to this inquiry may be fouud in an extract from a singularly able exposition of the Rights of British America, prepared by Mr. Jefferson, and laid before the Convention of Virginia, which assembled in August, 1774, for the purpose of appointing delegates to the proposed Congress. I will read this extract:

"*The abolition of domestic slavery* is the greatest object of desire in these colonies, where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state. But, previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves, it is necessary to exclude further importations from Africa. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, and by imposing duties which might amount to prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by his Majesty's negative; thus preferring the immediate advantage of a few African corsairs to the lasting interests of the American States, and the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice."—*Am. Archives, 4th series, vol.* 1, *p.* 696.

The Congress, which soon after assembled, shared these sentiments. Among its first acts was the framing of the celebrated Articles of Association, which composed the Non-Importation, Non-Exportation, and Non-Consumption Agreement. I will read the second of those articles:

"That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next, after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, or sell our commodities or manufactures, to those who are concerned in it." *Am. Archives, 4th series, vol.* 1, *p.* 914.

There was another article in this agreement, which I will read:

"Art. 14. And we do farther agree and resolve, that we will have no trade, commerce, dealings, or intercourse whatever, with any colony or province in North America which shall not accede to, or which shall hereafter violate, this association, but will hold them as unworthy of the rights of freemen, and as inimical to the liberties of this country."—*Am. Archives, 4th series, vol.* 1, *p.* 915.

Well, sir, this solemn covenant, thus pledging every colony and every citizen to an entire abandonment and suppression of the slave trade, was signed by every delegate in Congress, southern and northern. Public sentiment on this subject was then unanimous, or next to unanimous, throughout the country. Among these signers we find the names of Rodney, McKean, and Read, of Delaware; Chase and Paca, of Maryland; Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia; Hosper and Hewes, of North Carolina; and Middleton, Rutledge, and Lynch, of South Carolina; all of whom subsequently subscribed the Declaration of Independence. We also find the names of George Washington and Patrick Henry.

Now, Mr. President, let it be remembered that these Articles of Association, entered into as a measure for obtaining a redress of grievances from the People and Government of Great Britain, and to the faithful observance of which, in all their stipulations, the delegates of the colonies pledged themselves and their constituencies, "under the sacred ties of virtue, honor, and love of country;" let it be remembered, I say, that these Articles constituted the first bond of American Union. The Union thus constituted was, to be sure, imperfect, partial, incomplete; but it was still a Union, a Union of the Colonies and of the People, for the great objects set forth in the Articles. And let it be remembered, also, that prominent in the list of measures agreed on in these Articles, was the discontinuance of the slave trade, with a view to the ultimate extinction of slavery itself.

I say with a view to the ultimate extinction of slavery, and I have authority for saying so. I ask attention to an extract from the proceedings of a town meeting at Danbury, Connecticut, held on the 12th of December, 1775:

"It is with singular pleasure we notice the second article of the Association, in which it is agreed to import no more negro slaves, as we cannot but think it a palpable absurdity so loudly to complain of attempts to enslave *us* while we are actually enslaving *others*."—*Am. Archives, 4th series, vol.* 1, *p.* 1038.

This was the Northern view. What was the Southern? We find it upon record in the proceedings of the Congress of the Representatives of Darien, in the colony of Georgia. Acceding to the Association, they declared their views in these words:

"We, the Representatives of the extensive district of Darien, in the colony of Georgia, being now assembled in Congress, by the authority and free choice of the inhabitants of said district, now freed from their fetters do resolve."

Then follow several resolutions setting forth the grounds of complaint against the oppressions of Great Britain, closing with the emphatic declaration which I now read:

"To show to the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motives, but by a general philanthropy for all mankind, of whatever climate, language, or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of Slavery in America, (however the uncultivated state of our country or other specious arguments may plead for it)—a practice founded in injustice and cruelty, and highly dangerous to our liberties as well as lives, debasing part of our fellow-creatures below men, and corrupting the virtue and morals of the rest, and laying the basis of that liberty we contend for, and which we pray the Almighty to continue to the latest posterity, upon a very wrong foundation. We therefore resolve at all times to *use our utmost endeavors for the manumission* of our slaves in this colony, upon the most safe and equitable footing for the masters and themselves."—*Am. Archives, 4th series, vol.* 1 *p.* 1135.

That, sir, was the Southern view. At least it was the view of a large and intelligent, and influential body of southern men. And with this understanding of their effects and tendency, the Articles of Association were adopted by colonial conventions, county meetings, and lesser assemblages, throughout the country, and became the law of America—the fundamental Constitution, so to speak, of the first American Union. It is needless to cite many resolutions of these meetings. They can be found in the American Archives by those who desire to investigate the subject. I will quote but two.

The first is a resolution of the Convention of Maryland, held in November 1774, readopted by a subsequent convention, more fully attended, in December of the same year:

"*Resolved*, That every member of this meeting will, and every person in the province should, strictly and inviolably observe and carry into execution the Association agreed on by the Continental Congress."

The other is the declaration adopted by a general meeting of the freeholders of James City county, Virginia, in November, 1774, in these words:

"The Association entered into by Congress being publicly read, the freeholders and other inhabitants of the county, that they might testify to the world their concurrence and hearty approbation of the measures adopted by that respectable body, very cordially acceded thereto, and did bind and oblige themselves, by the sacred ties of virtue, honor and love to their country, strictly and inviolably to observe and keep the same in every particular."

These, sir, are specimens of the formal and solemn declarations and engagements of public bodies. To show the sentiment which prevaded the masses of the people, I will read an extract from an eloquent paper, entitled "Observations addressed to the People of America," printed at Philadelphia in November, 1774:

"The least deviation from the resolves of Congress will be treason; such treason as few villains have ever had an opportunity of committing. It will be treason against the present inhabitants of the colonies, against the millions of unborn generations who are to exist hereafter in America, against the only liberty and happiness which remait to mankind, against the last hopes of the wretched in every corner of the world; in a word, it will be treason against God. * * * We are now laying the foundations of an American Constitution. Let us, therefore, hold up everything we do to the eye of posterity. They will most probably measure their liberties and happiness by the most careless of our footsteps. Let no unhallowed hand touch the precious seed of liberty. Let us form the glorious tree in such a manner, and impregnate it with such principles of life, that it shall last forever. * * * *I almost wish to live to hear the triumphs of the jubilee in the year* 1784; to see the medals, pictures, fragments of writings, that shall be displayed to revive the memory of the proceedings of the Congress of 1775. If any adventitious circumstance shall give precedency on that day, it shall be to inherit the blood, or even to posess the name, of a member of that glorious assembly."—*American Archives. 4th series. vol.* 1. *p.* 976.

In these various resolves and declarations, Mr. President, we have the first expressions of the public sentiment and will of the American people upon this subject of Slavery. The earliest action of the associated colonies was Anti-Slavery action. The Union which they then formed was indeed, as I have said, incomplete, but it was complete enough to warrant the Congress which represented it in declaring independence, in waging war, in contracting debts; in assuming, in short, many of the functions of nationality and sovereignty.

Well, sir, nearly two years passed by, and the grievances of the colonies remained unredressed. The war of the Revolution had begun, and the Declaration of Independence was promulgated. That instrument breathed the same spirit as the Articles of Association. The original draught, as it came from the hands of Jefferson, contained a clause reprobating in the strongest terms the traffic in men. I will read it:

"He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him; captivating and carrying them into Slavery into another hemisphere, or to incur a miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of *Infidel* Powers, is the warfare of the *Christian* King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain the execrable commerce."

This clause was indeed omitted from the Declaration, not because it did not express the sentiments of the majority of Congress, but, as Mr. Jefferson informs us, in compliance to South Carolina and Georgia. He intimates also that some tenderness under these censures was manifested by Northern gentlemen, whose constituents had been somewhat largely engaged in the slave trade. But still the great fundamental truth, which constitutes the basis of all just government, and which condemns equally every form of oppression, was retained in the Declaration, and announced to the world as self-evident: the truth that "all men are created equal; "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, "liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights Governments were instituted "among men, deriving their just powers from the "consent of the governed."

Thus we see, that, in this second great act of the American people, the fundamental truth, upon which the Articles of Association were based, was reiterated—not as a "rhetorical flourish," not as an abstraction incapable of practical application in human affairs, but as a living principle, not to be disregarded, without fatal consequences, in the structure or administration of Government. That such was the view actually taken of the Declaration at that time, is further evident from the language of the despatches transmitting it to the authorities of the different colonies, and to the commander-in-chief of the army. I will quote a paragraph from the letter of the President of Congress, John Hancock, to the Convention of New Jersey:

"I do myself the honor to enclose, in obedience to the commands of Congress, a copy of the Declaration of Independence, which you will please to have proclaimed in your colony in such way and manner as you judge best. The important consequences resulting to the American States from this Declaration of Independence, *considered as the ground and foundation of a future Government*, will naturally suggest the propriety of proclaiming it in such a mode as that the people may be universally informed of it."—*American Archives, 5th series, vol.* 1, *p.* 11.

Such were the principles, Mr. President, of the Government and the people during the struggle for independence. They were reiterated at the close of it. Very shortly after the treaty of peace was ratified in 1783, Congress issued an address to the States, drawn up by Mr. Madison, the main purpose of which was to pursuade to the provision of a fund for the discharge of the public engagements. That address contains the clause which I will now read:

"Let it be remembered, finally, that it has ever been the pride and boast of America that the rights for which she contended were *the rights of human nature*. By the blessing of the *Author of these rights* on the means exerted for their defence, they have prevailed against all opposition, and *form the basis of thirteen independent States*. No instance has heretofore occurred, nor can any instance be expected hereafter to occur, in which the unadulterated forms of republican government can pretend to so fair an opportunity of justifying themselves by their fruits. In this view, the citizens of the United States are responsible for the greatest trust ever confided to a political society."—1 *Madison Papers, Ap.* 11.

This, sir, was the acknowledgment of 1783:—That the war of the Revolution was waged not to vindicate privileges, but rights: not the rights of any part or class of the people, but the rights of all men—"the rights of human nature."

It was not long before an occasion arose to test the sincerity of Congress in these various declarations; to determine whether or not Congress was prepared to carry the principles so solemnly recognized into practical application, without respect to persons or sections. Nor was Congress wanting to the occasion.

In March 1784 Virginia ceded to the United States all her claim to the territory north-west of the Ohio. Much praise has been awarded to Virginia for this cession. I desire to detract nothing from it. Virginia, doubtless, confided fully in the validity of her title to the territory which she ceded. It is true that, acting under her authority, and in anticipation of an expedition ordered by Congress, the gallant George Rogers Clarke, at the head of a handful of brave Kentuckians, dispossessed the British authorities of that portion of the territory which they had occupied on the Wabash and Mississippi. But it is right to say, and I am bound to say, that the validity of the Virginia title was never recognized, was always contested, by Congress.—Other States claimed interesis in the same territory. New York claimed the whole; Connecticut claimed a part, and Massachusetts also advanced a claim. Against all these demands, Congress asserted a right, in behalf of the United States, to the entire trans-Alleghanian region, as crown lands, acquired from Great Britain by the common blood and treasure of all the States, and appealed to the claimant States to relinquish their pretensions. New York was the first to respond to this appeal, and her cession was accepted by Congress in 1782. Virginia had previously proposed to cede all her claim north-west of the Ohio on certain conditions; but the conditions not being admitted, the cession was not accepted. Subsequently the contest was terminated by a satisfactory cession, made by Virginia and accepted by Congress. It was an arrangement, in fact, which involved concessions on both sides. Virginia yielded to the United States all her claims to territory northwest of the Ohio, and the United States tacitly surrendered to Virginia all claim to the territory southeast of that river, alleged to be within her chartered limits. I have thought it my duty to make these observations, as a Senator of a State whose rights and interests, as well as the rights and interests of her sister States of Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois, are affected to some extent, by the claim of exclusive title to the western country which has been advanced in behalf of Virginia.

Whatever the title of Virginia may have been, however, it is certain that upon her cession, made as I have said, on the 1st of March, 1784, the United States came into the undisputed ownership and sovereignty of the vast region northwest of the Ohio. To dispose of the soil and to determine the political institutions of the territory, now became the duty of Congress: and the duty was promptly performed. On the very day of the cession, before the sun went down, Thomas Jefferson, in behalf of a committee, consisting of himself, Mr. Howell of Rhode Island, and Mr. Chase of Maryland, reported a plan for the government of the Western Territory—not that lying north of the Ohio merely, but of all, from the north line of Florida to the north line of the United States. This, sir, is a memorable document of our early history, and I propose to read portions of it to the Senate:

"The territory *ceded, or to be ceded*, by the individual States to the United States, * * * shall be formed into distinct States. * * * The settlers * * * shall, either on their own petition or on the order of Congress, receive authority, with appointments of time and place, for their free males of full age, to meet together for the purpose of establishing a temporary Government. * * * Such temporary Government shall only continue in force, in any State, until it shall have acquired twenty thousand inhabitants: when, giving due proof thereof to Congress, they shall receive from them authority, with appointments of time and place, to call a convention of representatives to establish a permanent Constitution and Government for themselves: *Provided*, That both the temporary and permanent Governments be established upon these principles as their basis."

Here follow sundry provisions, the last of which is as follows:

"*That after the year* 1800 *of the Christian era there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty.*"

This, sir, was the plan and *proviso* of Jefferson. It met the approbation of the American people. It proved that the declaration of 1776 was not an empty profession, but a true faith. It proved that the spirit of the covenant of 1774 yet animated the heart of the nation. According to this grand and comprehensive scheme, the commencement of the nineteenth century was to witness the inauguration of freedom, as the fundamental and perpetual law of the transmontane half of the American Republic.

Had this plan and proviso been adopted, we should not now be discussing the questions which embarrass us. The extension of Slavery would have been limited by the Alleghanies. No slave could ever have trodden a foot of the soil beyond. Unhappily, however, the proviso was not adopted; and, as I have already said that it met the approval of the people, I ask attention to the proceedings which resulted in its rejection. On the 19th of April, Mr. Spaight, of North Carolina, moved that the proviso be stricken out. Under the Articles of Confederation, which governed the proceedings of Congress, a majority of the thirteen States was necessary to an affirmative decision of any question; and the vote of no State could be counted, unless represented by at least two delegates.

The question upon Mr. Spaight's motion was put in this form:

"Shall the words moved to be struck out stand?"

The vote stood—

For the proviso, six States, viz: New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Against the proviso, three States, viz: Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina.

Delaware and Georgia were not represented.—New Jersey, by Mr. Dick, voted *aye*, but her vote, only one delegate being present, could not be counted. The vote of North Carolina was divided—Mr. Williamson voting *aye*, Mr. Spaight, *no*. The vote of Virginia stood—Mr. Jefferson, *aye*, Messrs. Hardy and Mercer, *no*. Of the twenty-three delegates present and voting, sixteen voted for, and seven against the proviso. Thus was the proviso defeated by a minority vote. The people were for it, the States were for it; but it failed in consequence of a provision which enabled the minority to control the majority. It so happened that Mr. Beatty, the colleague of Mr. Dick, had left Congress a day or two before, and returned a day or two after. Had he been present, or had one of Mr. Jefferson's colleagues voted with him, the result would have been changed.* How vast the consequences, which, in this instance, depended on a single vote.

Well, sir, the ordinance of 1784, thus maimed and otherwise mutilated, became the law of the land on the 23d of April following. In 1785, Mr. Jefferson went abroad as Minister to France, and was out of the country until after the adoption of the Constitution. The agitation of the proviso, however, did not cease in consequence of his absence. In that same year, (1785,) Mr. King, of Massachusetts, again moved the proviso in Congress, in a slightly modified form, as follows:

"That there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States described in the resolves of Congress of the 23d of April, 1784, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been personally guilty; and that this regulation shall be an article of compact, and remain a fundamental principle of the Constitutions between the thirteen original States, and each of the States described in the said resolve of the 23d of April, 1784."—4 *Jour. Old Cong.* 481.

The resolution was ordered to be committed by the votes of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland—eight; against the votes of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia—four. Delaware was not represented. The vote of Maryland was determined by two ayes against one no, while that of Virginia was determined by two noes against one aye. The decided favor shown to this resolution by the vote for its commitment was the more remarkable, inasmuch as it proposed the immediate prohibition of Slavery, quired and to be acquired.

No further action was had at this time; but in a little more than two years afterwards, the subject was brought for the third time before Congress, in connection, as before, with the government of the western territory. The ordinance of 1784, from causes into which it is not material to inquire, had never been carried into practical operation. Settlements were about to commence in the North-west, and the settlers needed protection and government. Congress, therefore, in 1787, resumed the consideration of the subject of western territory. These deliberations resulted in the celebrated ordinance of 1787, the last great act, and among the greatest acts of the Congress of the Confederation; an act which received the unanimous votes of the States, and with a single exception from New York, of all the delegates. This ordinance, in its sixth article of compact, expressly prohibited Slavery and involuntary servitude, except for crime, throughout the territory. It abolished existing Slavery, and it forbade future Slavery. It covered with this prohibition every inch of territory then belonging to the United States. It expressly declared the national policy which this prohibition and kindred provisions contained in the articles of compact were meant to indicate and establish. This is its language:

"For extending the *fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty*, whereon these republics, their laws and constitutions, are erected; *to fix and establish* those principles as the basis *of all laws, constitutions, and governments*, which *forever* hereafter shall be formed in the said territory: * * Be it ordained and declared," &c.

To guard against possible future departure from this policy, it was ordained that these articles should "forever remain unalterable," unless altered by the common consent of the original States, and the people and States in the territory."

It is hardly possible to conceive of a more explicit declaration of governmental policy than this. The state of public sentiment in regard to Slavery, which resulted in this positive and unanimous exclusion of it from national territory, is well described in a letter of Mr. Jefferson to Dr. Price, who published about that time a book in favor of emaacipation. The letter bears date Paris, August 7th, 1785. I will read an extract:

"Southward of the Chesapake, it will find but few readers concurring with it [Dr. P.'s book] in sentiment on the subject of Slavery. From the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve it in theory, and it will find a respectable minority ready to adopt it in practice; a minority which, for weight and worth of character, preponderates against the greater number who have not the courage to divest their families of a property which, however, keeps their conscience uneasy. Northward of the Chesapeake, you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there a robber or a murderer; but in no greater number. In that part of America, there being but few slaves, they can easily disencumber themselves of them; and emancipation is put into such a train that in a few years there will be no slaves, northward of Maryland. In Maryland I do not find such a disposition to begin the redress of the enormity as in Virginia. This is the next State to which we may turn our eye for the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression; a conflict wherein the sacred side is gaining daily recruits from the influx into office of young men, grown and growing up."

The general state of opinion is also well expressed by Mr. Jefferson in his Notes on Virginia, where he says:

"I think a change already perceptible since the origin of our present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating; that of the slave is rising from the dust, his condition modifying, and the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of Heaven, for a total emancipation."

In another place, declaring his own sentiments, he said:

"Nobody wishes more ardently than I to see an abolition not only of the trade, but of the condition of Slavery; and certainly nobody will be more willing to encounter any sacrifice for that object."

These sentiments were shared by nearly every distinguished character of that time.

In a letter to Robert Morris, dated Mount Vernon, April 12, 1786, George Washington said:

"I can only say that there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it, [Slavery;] but there is only one proper and effectual mode in which it can be accomplished, and that is by legislative authority; and this, so far as my suffrage will go, shall never be wanting."—9 *Sparks' Washington*, 158.

In a letter to John F. Mercer, September 9, 1786, he reiterated this sentiment:

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstances should compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which Slavery in this country may be abolished by laws."—*Ibid.*

And in a letter to Sir John Sinclair, he further said:

"There are in Pennsylvania laws for the gradual abolition of Slavery, which neither Virginia nor Maryland have at present, but which nothing is more certain than they must have, and at a period *not remote*."

It is unnecessary to multuply these extracts. So universal were these sentiments, that Mr. Leigh, in the Convention, of Virginia, in 1832, did not hesitate to say:

"I thought till very lately, that it was known to everybody that, during the Revolution, and for many years after, the abolition of Slavery was a favorite topic with many of our ablest statesmen, who entertained with respect all the schemes which wisdom or ingenuity could suggest for its accomplishment."

I think, Mr. President, that two facts may now be regarded as established: *First*, that in 1787 the national policy in respect to Slavery was one of restriction, limitation, and discouragement. *Secondly*, that it was generally expected that under the action of the State governments Slavery would gradually disappear from the States.

Such was the state of the country when the Convention met to frame the Constitution of the United States. That Convention was sitting in Philadelphia while Congress was framing the Ordinance in New York.

It has been said, in the course of this debate, that there was some understanding between Congress and the Convention in regard to the question of Slavery. That may be so. There is, however, nothing in history which proves it, though circumstances do certainly seem to warrant such a conjecture. But, if there was an understanding, to what did it relate? Not certainly to the whole subject of Slavery; for, up to the time of the promulgation of the ordinance, no discussion had taken place in the Convention on that subject, except in respect to the question of representation and taxation. That question had been discussed with considerable heat; so much, indeed, that some members declared themselves ready to break up the Convention rather than consent to the representation of slaves. The exclusion of Slavery from the territories by the ordinance may have had, and may have been intended to have, some influence upon this discussion. It may be that members from the free States, seeing Slavery excluded from national territory, and supposing its extension to be thereby forever interdicted, were the more willing to consent to a representation of slaves as a temporarary arrangement, which would cease of itself when Slavery itself should cease or run out, at some period "not remote." But there is not a particle of foundation for any supposition that there was any understanding between Congress and freedom were entitled to equal regard in the action of the Government. Far from it. Whatever understanding there was, if there was any, must have been based upon the idea of Slavery restriction, upon the fact that its extension was prohibited, and that its final disappearance was expected.

The framers of the Constitution acted under the influence of the general sentiment of the country. Some of them had contributed in no small measure to form that sentiment. Let us examine the instrument in its light, and ascertain the original import of its language.

What, then, shall we find in it? The guarantees so much talked of? Recognition of property in men? Stipulated protection for that property in national territories and by national law? No, sir; nothing like it.

We find, on the contrary, extreme care to exclude these ideas from the Constitution. Neither the word "slave" nor "Slavery" is to be found in any provision. There is not a single expression which charges the National Government with any responsibility in regard to Slavery. No power is conferred on Congress either to establish or sustain it. The framers of the Constitution left it where they found it, exclusively within and under the jurisdiction of the States. Wherever slaves are referred to at all in the Constitution, whether in the clause providing for the apportionment of representation and direct taxation, or in that stipulating for the extradition of fugitives from service, or in that restricting Congress as to the prohibition of importation or migration, they are spoken of, not as persons held as property, but as persons held to service or having their condition determined, under State laws. We learn, indeed, from the debates in the Constitutional Convention, that the idea of property in men was excluded with special solicitude.

Mr. Madison declared, he "thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men."—3 *Mad. Pap.*, 1429.

Mr. Gerry thought the Convention "had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slaves, but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it."—*Mad. Pap.*, 1394.

Similar expressions were used by other members. But I need go no further. Multiplied words will not convince those who will not regard the language of the Constitution itself, or the plain declarations of its framers.

It may, however, be worth while to refer briefly to the views expressed in the State Conventions which convened for the purpose of considering the Constitution with a view to its ratification. Did they expect the extension or continuance of Slavery through the action or under the protection of the Government which they were called on to establish? Not at all.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, had been a leading member of the Convention, and in the Ratification Convention of his State, when speaking of the clause relating to the power of Congress over the slave trade after twenty years, he said:

"I consider this Clause as laying the foundation for banishing Slavery out of this country; and though the period is more distant than I could wish it, it will produce the same kind, gradual change as was produced in Pennsylvania. * * * * The *new* States which are to be formed will be under the *control* of Congress in this particular, and Slavery will never be introduced among them."—2 *Elliot's Debates*, 452.

In another place, speaking of this clause, he said:

"It presents us with the pleasing prospect that the rights of mankind will be acknowledged and established throughout the Union. If there was no other lovely feature in the Constitution but this one, it would diffuse a beauty over its whole countenance. Yet the lapse of a few years, and Congress will have power to exterminate Slavery from within our borders."—2 *Elliot's Debates*, 484.

In the Ratification Convention of Massachusetts, General Heath said:

"The migration or importation, &c., is confined to the States now existing only; new States cannot claim it. Congress, by their ordinance for creating new States, some time since declared that the new States shall be republican, and that there shall be no Slavery in them."—2 *Elliot's Debates*, 115.

Nor were these views and anticipations confined to the free States. In the Ratification Convention in Virginia, Mr. Johnson said:

"They tell us that they see a progressive danger of bringing about emancipation. The principle has begun since the Revolution. Let us do what we will, it will come round. Slavery has been the foundation of much of that impiety and dissipation which have been so much disseminated among our countrymen. If it were totally abolished, it would do much good."—3 *Elliot's Debates*, 6—48.

And Governor Randolph, while denying and justly denying, the power of the General Government, under the Constitution, to interfere with Slavery in the States, rebuked those who expressed apprehensions that its influence might be exerted on the side of freedom, by saying:

"I hope that there are none here who, considering the subject in the calm light of philosophy, will advance an objection dishonorable to Virginia, that, at the moment they are securing the rights of their citizens, there is a spark of hope that those unfortunate men now held in *bondage* may, by the operation of the General Government, be made *free*."—3 *Elliot's Debates*, 598.

But the people were not satisfied with the fact that no power to invade personal freedom was conferred on Congress by the Constitution. They demanded direct and positive guarantees of personal rights. In compliance with these demands, several of the Ratification Conventions proposed to Congress such amendments as were desired by their respective States.

Virginia proposed a bill of rights, omitting, singularly enough, the first and fundamental provision of her own bill of rights, namely, that "all men are born equally free and independent," but containing this provision:

"No *freeman* ought to be taken, imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, liberties, privileges, or franchises, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life, liberty, or property, *but by the law of the land*."—3 *Elliot's Debates*, 658.

North Carolina and Rhode Island each proposed the same clause. (4 *Elliot's Debates*, 243; 1 *Ib.*, 334.) New York proposed a different provision:

"No *person* ought to be taken, imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold, or be exiled, or deprived of his privileges, franchises, life, liberty, or property, but by due process of law.—1 *Elliot's Debates*, 328.

These various propositions came before Congress, and that body, at its first session, agreed upon several amendments to the Constitution, which were subsequently ratified by the States. That which related to personal liberty was expressed in these comprehensive words:

"No person * * * * shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."—*Cons., Amend*, Art. 5.

In my judgment, sir, if this amendment had never been made, Congress would have had no power to institute Slavery; that is to say, to enforce, by its laws, the subjection of one man to the absolute control and disposal of another man: for no such power is conferred by the Constitution, and the action of Congress must be restrained within its delegated powers. But the amendment is an express guarantee of personal liberty. It is an express prohibition against its invasion. So long as it remains a part of the Constitution, and is obeyed, Slavery cannot be constitutionally introduced anywhere or maintained anywhere by the legislation of Congress. It must depend, and depend wholly, upon State law, both for existence and support. Beyond State limits, within the boundaries of the United States, there can be constitutionally no slave.

Here I may pause. I have rapidly sketched the rise of the American Government and the American Union, so far as their relations to American Slavery are involved, from their origin in the Association of 1774, to the adoption of the Constitution in all this action—a spirit of profound reverence for the rights of man as man—the principle of perfect equality of men before the law.

Animated by this spirit and guided by this principle, the Association bound all its members to discontinue the slave trade. If any of them continued it—and some of them did—the guilt was on their own heads only, for the Association had no power to enforce the covenant. When the American Congress resolved on independence, they solemnly announced the great doctrine of inalienable rights as the basis of the national political faith and the foundation of all just government. When the war of the Revolution was over, they renewed the declaration, that the contest which they had waged was in defence of the rights of human nature. When the acquisition of the Northwestern Territory presented an opportunity of carrying into practical application their exalted principles, they did not hesitate, but established them forever as the basis of all laws, constitutions, and governments, within its limits. When the Confederation proved inadequate to the exigencies of the Republic, and the people undertook the work of reforming their political system, they constituted the new Government and established the new Constitution upon principles which made the enslavement of men by the Government under the Constitution a legal impossibility. Let those who are inclined to murmur because no more was done, ask themselves, by what people, in what age besides, has so much been done for the cause of freedom and right? Up to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, there was not a single slave in America, made such or held such, under any law of the United States. Had the policy of the founders of the Republic been pursued, and had the principles which they established been faithfully carried out in legislation and administration, there would have been now no slave anywhere under exclusive national jurisdiction—probably no slave within the boundaries of the Republic.

Unhappily, however, the original policy of the Government and the original principles of the Government in respect to Slavery did not permanently control its action. A change occurred—almost imperceptible at first, but becoming more and more marked and decided, until nearly total. The honorable Senator from Massachusetts in the course of his late speech noticed this change, and ascribed it to the rapid increase in the production of cotton. Doubtless, sir, that was a leading cause. The production of cotton, in consequence of the invention of the cotton gin, increased from 487,600 pounds in 1793, to 6,275,300 pounds in 1796, and continued to increase very rapidly afterwards. Of course the market value of slaves advanced, and masters were less inclined to emancipation.

But the increase of the cotton crop was not the only, nor, in my judgment, the chief cause of altered public sentiment and governmental action. The change in the structure of the Government which introduced into one branch of the Legislature, and into the electoral college, a representation for slaves, constituted, I think, a far more potent cause. I will sketch the progress of the power derived from this source, for I think it important that its practical operation should be understood. I admit that it is conferred by the Constitution; but——

Mr. Borland.—Will the honorable Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Chase. Certainly.

Mr. Borland.—I think I understood the Senator as giving as a reason for adhering to the institution of Slavery on the part of southern statesmen, that the Constitution allowed the slave population to form a basis of representation. Does the Senator give that as a reason why they adhered to the institution of Slavery, and became more attached to it?

Mr. Chase.—I believe that was one of the reasons.

Mr. Borland.—Then I can say to the Senator that his argument, it seems to me, confutes itself; for the reason that if the slaves were liberated, each would be counted; whereas, being retained as slaves, only three-fifths of their number are brought into the computation, and we loose two-fifths.

Mr. Chase.—Undoubtedly, Mr. President, if the slaves were free they would be reckoned at their full number in the basis of representation; but the influence of their representation upon the character of the Government would be wholly changed. There would be no slave interest.

Mr. Borland.—Free negroes are represented.

Mr. Chase.—I am obliged to the Senator from Arkansas for the information he gives me; I had

* 4 Journals Cong. Confed. 374; see also Cong. Globe 1848-'49, Appen. 294, Speech of Hon John A. Dix.

learned the facts he states from the Constitution? Why, sir, is it not quite obvious that in a district where the number of slaves is considerable, even if suffrage be universal, the number of votes must be proportionably reduced? And, inasmuch as slaveholders are usually the chief landholders and property holders, and have a common interest, is it not quite obvious that they will generally be able to wield the political power of the district? Destroy the slave representation, and their power is gone. Enfranchise the slaves, and there are no slaveholders, and of course no slave power. Enfranchisement will, doubtless, increase the political power of the State, but it will annihilate the slave power. I repeat, Mr. President, and they who think me wrong may refute what I say, if they can, that there must have been some adequate cause or causes for the remarkable change of feeling and action in regard to Slavery which began to manifest itself about this time, and that these causes, in my judgment, were—*first*, the political power derived by slaveholders from the representation of three-fifths of their slaves; and, *secondly*, the augmented value of slaves arising from the sudden increase of the cotton culture. The last of these causes requires no further consideration; but I wish to direct attention somewhat more particularly to the first.

The first apportionment was made by the Constitution Convention. Regard was had, doubtless, to the three-fifths rule in determining the number of of Representatives assigned to each State; but we cannot now ascertain how many were allowed for the slaves. The census supplies the means of ascertaining the precise quantum of slave representation in each decennial period since the apportionment. I now propose to submit to the Senate a table which exhibits at one view each decennial period since the adoption of the Constitution; the number of inhabitants required for one Representative; the number of slaves reckoned at three-fifths of the actual number; and the number of Representatives for slaves for each period:

Decennial period.	Representative number.	Three-fifths of slaves	Representatives for slaves.
1790–1800	30,000	408,737	13
1800–1810	33,000	535,824	16
1810–1820	35 000	714 816	20
1820–1830	40.000	922 839	23
1830–1840	40,700	1,205.418	25
1840–1850	70 680	1 493,013	21

From this table it appears that in the very first Congress, if the Convention based their original apportionment upon anything like a correct estimate of the population, there must have been at least ten representatives of slaves, and that in the second Congress there were thirteen. It was impossible that the influence of this representation should not be felt. It was natural, though it does seem to have been anticipated, that the unity of the slave interest, strengthened by this accession of political power, should gradually weaken the public sentiment and modify the national policy against Slavery.

Well, sir, occasion was not so long wanting to test the dispositions of Congress in this respect. At an early period of the second session of the first Congress, petitions were presented from the Society of Friends in Philadelphia and New York, and from the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, of which Benjamin Franklin was the President, praying Congress to take such measures as the Constitution would permit to discountenance and discourage Slavery and the slave trade. A similar address had been made by a deputation of Friends to the Congress of the Confederation, in 1783, who were received and heard with great respect though Congress, having no power over the subject, was obliged to decline taking such action as was desired.* The petitions now presented were not treated with similar consideration. They were, however, received, and referred, and in due time a report was made. In this report the limits of the powers of Congress over the subjects of Slavery and the slave trade were carefully defined. In regard to Slavery in the States, it expressed the fullest "confidence in the wisdom 'and humanity of the legislatures, that they would 'revise their laws from time to time, when necessary, and *promote the objects mentioned in the 'memorials*, and every other measure that may tend 'to the happiness of slaves;" and, in regard to Slavery within the sphere of the legitimate action of Congress, it concluded with the following expression:

"That the memorialists be informed that, in all cases to which the authority of Congress extends, they will exercise it for the humane objects of the memorialists, so far as they can be promoted on the principles of justice, humanity, and good policy."—2 *Deb. Cong., Old Ser.*, 1465.

especially by the members from South Carolina and Georgia, who denounced the petitioners and their objects, not sparing even the venerable Franklin, very much in the style of later days. The African slave trade itself came in for a share of approval and vindication.

It was apparent that there was a large majority in favor of the report; but a desire to satisfy even unreasonable objectors, induced the concession of one point after another, until the report was reduced to three propositions: *First*, that migration or importation could not be prohibited prior to 1808: *Second*, that Congress had not power to interfere in the emancipation or treatment of slaves in the States: *Third*, that Congress could prohibit the slave trade by the citizens of the United States for the supply of foreigners, and provide for humane treatment, on their passage, of those imported into the States. The last resolution of the original report, which pledged the Government, in conformity with its past policy and professed principles, to promote the objects of the memorialists, was stricken out altogether.

This was the first fruit of intimidation on the one side, and concession and compromise on the other. The majority of the House forbore to express their own settled convictions; forbore to pledge themselves to that course of disfavor to Slavery and the slave trade, which consistency, honor, and humanity, required of them; yielded everything of substance, and retained little else than form. Could they have seen that this was but the first step in a long line of concessions, perhaps not yet ended, surely the patriotic men who composed that Congress would never have taken that first step.

What followed, sir? In that same year, North Carolina tendered to the United States cession of the territory lying between the mountains which form her present western boundary and the Mississippi, and now constitututing the State of Tennessee, upon condition "that the inhabitants should have all the privileges, benefits, and advantages, of the ordnance of 1787, provided, always, that no regulations made or to be made by Congress should tend to emancipate slaves." Congress accepted this cession, and provided for the government of the country ceded as a slaveholding territory.

Hitherto Congress had never sanctioned slaveholding. Never hitherto had a single slave been held under any authority emanating from Congress. On the contrary, as we have seen, in all the territory hitherto acquired, Slavery had been promptly abolished, and impregnable barriers erected against its renewed introduction. The acceptance of the North Carolina cession reversed the policy of the Government, and was a step in the wrong direction. To preserve the dominion of a few masters over an inconsiderable number of slaves, established policy, settled principle, and safe precedent, were alike disregarded. It was a mischievous—an almost fatal error.

In 1802, Georgia ceded to the United States the country lying between her present western limit and the Mississippi, stipulating that the ordinance of 1787, in all its provisions, should extend to the ceded territory, "that article only excepted which forbids Slavery." This cession was accepted, and the territory placed under a territorial government, restricted from all interference with Slavery. This was the second chapter in the history of reaction.†

In 1803, we acquired Louisiana by purchase from the French Republic. There were at that time about forty thousand slaves held within its limits, under the French law. The treaty contained this stipulation:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and, in the mean time, they shall be maintained in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."—8 *United States Statutes at Large*, 202.

This stipulation, interpreted according to the plain sense of its terms, and carried into practical effect, would have enfranchised every slave in Louisiana; for no one, I apprehend, will venture to affirm that the slaves were not inhabitants. Independently of this stipulation, it was the duty of the Government—even more imperative than in 1787, for since then the whole country south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi had been formed into slave States and slave territories—to establish freedom as the fundamental law of the new acquisition. But this duty was not performed. There was some feeble legislation against the introduction of slaves from foreign countries, and of slaves imported since 1798 from the other States; but that was all, and that was useless.

Then came the cession of Florida by Spain in 1820. The stipulation in the treaty was substantially the same as in the treaty with France:* the duty of the Government in respect to the acquisition was the same; and there was the failure to perform it.

Finally, Texas came in, in 1845, not as a territory, but as a State. Within her limits, Slavery was never under the control of Congress. The existence of Slavery there was an objection to her admission into the Union; but once admitted, and admitted as a State, her internal legislation on that subject was as much beyond the reach of the National Government as before.

Now, sir, what would have been the result if the policy which formed the cessions of North Carolina, Georgia, France, and Spain, into slave territories, and finally admitted slaveholding Texas, had prevailed in 1787? Slavery, it is well known, existed in the Northwestern Territory. The honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has informed us that Slavery was continued in that State, notwithstanding the ordinance, under the protection of the State constitution. We know what persevering efforts—continued from 1802 to 1807, and until final rejection of the application here—were used to induct Congress to suspend the operation of the Slavery prohibition in the ordinance in respect to all the territory not included within the limits of Ohio. We know what arguments were employed—the same precisely which have ever since been urged by those who would reconcile the people to the extension of Slavery—the same, doubtless, which were urged with too fatal success to persuade the National Legislature to its first departure from the policy of 1774 and 1787. It was said that Slavery would not be increased by the proposed extension, its only effect being to change the locality of persons already slaves; that the happiness of the slaves would be promoted by increased comforts of their new abodes; and, finally, that emancipation would be promoted by spreading the slaves over the largest possible extent of territory, and thereby making emancipation safe.†

These facts furnish conclusive proof that but for the positive prohibition of Slavery by the ordinance of 1787, every foot of land west of the Alleghany mountains would have been at this day slave soil. No law of physical geography or formation of the earth, no want of adaptation of soil or climate to the great staples of slave labor, no imaginary barrier in degrees of latitude, would have arrested the progress of the fatal blight.

Let us be thankful that the wisdom of the founders of the Republic foresaw, and by positive prohibition prevented this great calamity. Let us be thankful, also, that those who followed them, though they failed to imitate their example, were yet unwilling to undo their work.

Let me now, sir, sum up the results of this policy of adding new slave territories and new slave States to the Union, which was substituted for the original policy of free territories and free States.

I make no remark here upon the admission of Kentucky. That State was a district of Virginia, and never a territory of the United States. But out of territories ceded to the Union, and actually organized under national jurisdiction, since the adoption of the Conatitution, seven slave States have been erected and admitted: Tennessee out of the cession of North Carolina; Alabama and Mississippi out of the cession of Georgia; Louisiana, Missouri, and Arkansas, out of the cession of France; and Florida out of the cession of Spain.—Besides these States, we have annexed slaveholding Texas, vast in her undisputed limits, and with vast claims beyond them. Here are eight new slave States, created and admitted out of territories, not one foot of which had been ceded to the United States prior to the Constitution, and five of them out of foreign territory acquired by purchase or annexation since its adoption.

Well, sir, where are the free States which have come into the Union out of these territories? There is but one. Iowa is the single State yet admitted out of all the vast territories acquired since the organization of the Government.

Thus, sir, we see that while the original policy of the Government secured to freedom all the territory acquired before the Constitution, and all the States erected out of it, the reversal of that policy secured to Slavery most of the territory subsequently acquired, and all the States formed out of it except one.

Now, sir, I desire to submit to the Senate a comparison of Slavery at the date of the Constitution, as freedom areas which have been devoted to freedom and to Slavery, respectively, in States created out of territories, and admitted into the Union since that date. I have compiled from the reports of the Commissioner of the Land Office a statement exhibiting this comparison, which I will read:

FREE STATES.

	Square miles.
States in 1787, including Vermont and Maine	164,081
States out of Northwestern Territory, viz: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin	239,345
State out of foreign territory acquired, viz: Iowa	50,914
	454,340

SLAVE STATES.

States in 1787, including Kentucky	243,642
States out of territory within original limits, viz: Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi	141,969
States out of foreign territory acquired, including Texas within her undisputed boundaries	373,786
	759,307
Difference in favor of slave States, in square miles	304,967
Add to this parts of Tamaulipas and Coahuila, between the Nueces and Rio Grande, claimed by Texas	52,018
Add also part of New Mexico, east of Rio Grande, claimed by Texas	124,933
And the vast aggregate difference would swell to	431,918

Upon inspection of this table, it will be seen that, had the original policy of the Government been persevered in, and no new slave States created out of territories, the difference of area in favor of freedom within the original limits of the Republic would have been 282,738 square miles; and all territory acquired beyond those limits would of course have been free. It will be seen, also, that the reversal of this policy reduced this difference to 18,905 square miles, and by acquisitions of foreign territory, changed the balance and created a difference in favor of Slavery of 304,967 square miles, which will be increased, if the claims of Texas are allowed, to the enormous quantity of 431,918 square miles. Within these limits Slavery suffers for want of room—is "cabined, cribbed, confined," and seeks a wider sphere!

Sir, complaints from the slave States, under these circumstances, sound strangely to me. Why, sir, has not the policy of the Government been reversed in favor of their system? Has not Slavery been extended to undreamed-of limits? Have not the slave States been more than doubled in number? Has not their area been almost tripled in extent? And yet they complain—complain of the aggressions of the North. They complain that the recapture of fugitive slaves is rendered difficult by free State legislation and free State sentiment; and that the subject of Slavery is discussed and adverse opinions formed in the free States, which the electors ask us to embody in national legislation; that Slavery has been already excluded from a portion of the national territories; and that a determination is manifested to prevent its further extension, and to restore the original policy of Slavery restriction and discouragement.

Now, sir, so far as these complaints have reference to the action of the people, it is impossible to appease them. This is a Government of the people, and the voice of the people must be heard and respected in its administration. The States also are governments of the people, and must be administered in conformity with the popular will. If the settled judgment and conscientious convictions of the people are against Slavery, legislation, within constitutional limits, must follow that judgment and those convictions.

And, so far as these complaints respect the former action of the National Government, they who make them complain of themselves. For where has resided the practical control of this Government? Let a few facts answer this question. At the close of the current Presidential term, the slave States will have held the Presidency fifty-two years; the free States only twelve years. Of the gentlemen who have filled the Department of State, fourteen have been from the slave States, and five only from the free. Thirteen of the Judges of the Supreme Court have been taken from the slave States; from the free States, twelve. No northern man has filled the office of Chief Justice during this century; and, notwithstanding the population of the free States is more than double the free population of the slave States, the latter have always been represented by a majority of the Judges upon the Supreme Bench. Of the Speakers of the House of Representatives, twelve had been from the slave States, and eight only from the free States; thus giving to the slave States the control of the appointment of the committees, and, consequently, of the business of the House. Sir, it cannot be denied that the power of this Government, in all its departments, has been for many years, practically and substantially in the hands of Southern men, and has been used to advance the interests, real or supposed, of the slave section of the country.

These are not my assertions merely. They are the assertions of our public history, confirmed by the testimony of southern gentlemen. I beg leave to quote an extract from the *Charleston Courier* of October 30, 1844:

"Our past experience has shown that the weight of the South has been heavily felt in the political balance, and has almost always monopolized high federal office.

"The southern or slaveholding States have given six out of ten Presidents to the Union; the northern or non-slaveholding States have given but four, and out of these four the two last were chosen by a large majority of southern votes, and the last was a native Virginian, filially devoted to the rights and interests of the land of his birth; and even the two first enlisted a strong southern support.

"Again, of the six southern Presidents, five were re-elected to their high offices, and each occupied it for eight years, and only one will have occupied it but four years, giving in all to the slaveholding interest the possession and control of the Presidency forty-four years out of fifty-six, while of the four non-slaveholding Presidents three occupied the Presidency but four years each, and one only a little month, giving in all to the non-slaveholding interest the possession and control of the Presidency for only twelve years out of fifty-six.

"So of the Chief Justices of the Union: the South has had three, and the North but two out of the five incumbents of that august judicial seat.

"At this moment (October 30, 1844) the southern or slaveholding interest enjoys a monopoly of high federal office, executive, judicial, legislative, military, and naval. John Tyler, of Virginia, is President; and his Cabinet consists of John C. Calhoun, a South Carolinian, Secretary of State; George M. Bibb, a Kentuckian, Secretary of the Treasury; John Y. Mason, a Virginian, Secretary of the Navy; Charles A. Wickliffe, a Kentuckian, Postmaster General; John Nelson, a Marylander, Attorney General; and William Wilkins, a Pennsylvanian, the single exception on the list, Secretary of War; Roger B. Taney, a Marylander, is Chief Justice of the United States; Willie P. Mangum, a North Carolinian, is President of the Senate; and John W. Jones, a Virginian, is Speaker of the House of Representatives; and southern men stand at the head of the most important committees of both branches of Congress; Winfield Scott, a Virginian, is Major General of our Army; and James Barron, a Virginian, senior officer of our navy; and, to crown all, Henry Clay, a Kentuckian, is the Whig, and James K. Polk, a Tennessean, the Democratic candidate for the next Presidency, securing to us the future as well as the past.

"If this be not the lion's share of political power, words have lost their meaning; if this be not enough to satisfy the South, she must be insatiable indeed."

All this, Mr. President, with unimportant modifications, is as true of 1850 as it was of 1844. The President and a majority of his Cabinet are slaveholders; the Speaker of the House is a slaveholder; the committees of both Houses are so constituted that the slave interest may receive no damage; and the slave States have now, as ever, a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court. The Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Departments are in the hands of the slave power. What more can they desire?

Having referred, Mr. President, to the Supreme Court, I desire to say something further in this place of the regard paid to the security of Slavery in the organization of that tribunal. No one joins more cordially than I in respectful acknowledgments of the probity, learning, and ability of the distinguished men who occupy its seats. But, eminent and upright as they are, they are not more than other men exempt from the bias of education, sympathy, and interest. It was but the other day that the honorable Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Davis,] speaking of the adjustment of the Texian boundary by this Government, said:

"In referring it to the Senate, Texas referred it to a body in which, at that time one-half the members had interests like those she desired to maintain. In referring it to the President, she referred it to a southern man, whose education and association warranted a reliance both on his information and his sympathies."

What more natural than that gentlemen from the slave States, in view of the questions like to come before the Supreme Court, should desire that a majority of its members might "have interests like those which they would desire to maintain?" Certain it is that some care has been taken to secure such a constitution of the court, and not without success. I have prepared a table showing at one view the circuits, the States composing them, and the aggregate free population in each, which I now submit:

FREE STATES.

Circuit.	States composing it.	Free population.
First	Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island	1,632,896
Second	Vermont, Connecticut, & New York	3,030,847
Third	New Jersey and Pennsylvania	2,097,339
Seventh	Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, & Michigan	2,893,783

SLAVE STATES.

Circuit.	States composing it.	Free population.
Fourth	Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia	1,246,572
Fifth	Alabama and Louisiana	521,283
Sixth	North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia	1,187,410
Eighth	Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri	1,569,163
Ninth	Mississippi and Arkansas	258,079

From this it will be seen that in order to secure a majority from the slave States upon the bench, the circuits are so arranged that, with something less than half of the Free population, the slave States have five circuits and five judges out of nine. The smallest of the slave State circuits contains little more than one-seventh of the free population of the smallest of the free State circuits; while the largest of the latter contains near twice the number of free inhabitants in the largest of the former. The four southwestern slave States, lying contiguous to each other, are divided into two circuits, while the four northwestern free States, with nearly four times the free population, compose but one.

Mr. President, I have spoken freely of slave State ascendency in the affairs of this Government, but I desire not to be misunderstood. I take no sectional position. The supporters of Slavery are the sectionalists, if sectionalists there are. Freedom is national; Slavery only is local and sectional. I do not complain at all that the offices of the country have been filled by southern gentlemen. Let them have the offices, if they will only administer the Government in conformity with its original principles. But I do complain that it has not been so administered; that its powers have been perverted to the support of an institution which those principles condemn and that in consequence of this perversion, we are involved in all the difficulties of the struggle between Slavery and freedom, in the midst of which we now are.

I shall now proceed still further to illustrate the character and results of the Slavery extension as contrasted with the Slavery restriction policy, by a comparison of the present condition of Ohio, in respect to population, area, and political power, with the seven slave States which have come into the Union since the date of her admission. I shall submit this comparison in tabular form:

State.	Date of admission	Free population 1840.	Area, square miles.	Votes for Pres V. Pres.	Reps.	Senators.	Electoral votes.
Ohio.	Nov. 29, 1802	1,519.467	39,694	328,633	21	2	23
	States admitted since.						
Lou.	April 8, 1812	183,959	46,431	33,653	4	2	6
Miss.	Dec. 10, 1817	180,440	47,147	51,376	4	2	6
Ala.	Dec. 14, 1819	337,224	50,732	61,845	7	2	9
Mo.	Aug. 10, 1827	325,462	67,380	72,748	5	2	7
Ark.	June 15, 1836	77,689	52,198	16,888	1	2	3
Fla.	Mar. 3, 1845	54,477	59,268	7,777	1	2	3
Tex.	Dec. 29, 1845	104,145	148,569	12 535	2	2	4
Aggregate of States.		1 263 336	471 715	236 822	24	14	38

These are the results. Ohio was admitted into the Union in 1802. She had, in 1840, upon an area of not quite forty thousand square miles, a free population of more than a million and a half, and three hundred and twenty-eight thousand voters. Seven slave States have been admitted since. They had, in 1840, making the proper deduction from the enumeration of Texas in 1847 given in the table, upon an area nearly twelve times greater than that of Ohio, a quarter of a million less inhabitants, and ninety thousand fewer voters. And yet these States, having, in addition to their free population, a representative population of four hundred and fifty-six thousand slaves, have three votes more in the House of Representatives, twelve votes more in the Senate, and fifteen votes more in the electoral college. Such are the fruits of Slavery extension—less population, larger area, and more political power.

And now, Mr. President, let me ask what have been the results, on a larger scale, of the subversion of the original policy of Slavery restriction and discouragement, and the substitution, in disregard of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, of the opposite policy? Why, sir, instead of six slave States—for I do not reckon among the slave States New York or New Jersey, in both which emancipation was expected in 1787, and soon after actually took place—instead of six slave States, we have fifteen; instead of a majority of free States, we have an equal number of slave and free; instead of seven hundred thousand slaves, we have three millions; instead of a property estimate of them at ten millions of dollars, we hear them rated at a thousand millions, and even fifteen hundred millions; instead of Slavery being regarded as a curse, a reproach, a light, an evil, a wrong, a sin, we are now told that it is the most stable foundation of our institutions; the happiest relation that labor can sustain to capital; a blessing to both races, the white and the black, the master and the slave.

Sir, this is a great change, and a sad change. If it goes on, the spirit of liberty must at length become extinct, and a despotism will be established under the forms of free institutions.

Mr. President, I do not know that any monument has been erected over the grave of Jefferson, in Virginia.

Mr. MASON.—There is—a granite obelisk.

Mr. CHASE.—I am glad to hear it. No monumental marble bears a nobler name.

Mr. SEWARD.—The inscription is: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia."

Mr. CHASE.—It is an appropriate inscription, and worthily commemorates distinguished services. But, Mr. President, if a stranger from some foreign land should ask me for the monument of Jefferson, I would not take him to Virginia, and bid him look on a granite obelisk, however admirable in its proportions or its inscriptions. I would ask him to accompany me beyond the Alleghanies, into the midst of the broad Northwest, and would say to him:

Si monumentum quæris, circumspice!

Behold, on every side, his monument. These thronged cities, these flourishing villages, these cultivated fields; these million happy homes of prosperous freemen, these churches, these schools; these asylums for the unfortunate and helpless; these institutions of education, religion, and humanity; these great states, great in their present resources, but greater far in the mighty energies by which the resources of the future are to be developed; these, these are the monuments of Jefferson. His memorial is over all our western land—

Our meanest rill, our mightiest river,
Rolls mingling with his fame forever.

But what monument should be erected to those whose misapplied talents, energy, and perseverance, have procured, or whose compromising timidity has permitted, the reversal of the policy of Jefferson? What inscription should commemorate the acts of those who have surrendered vast territories to Slavery; who have disappointed the expectations of the fathers of the Republic; who have prepared for our country the dangers and difficulties which are now around us and upon us? It is not for me, sir, to say what that inscription should be. Let it remain a blank forever.

Without concluding, Mr CHASE gave way for a motion to adjourn; whereupon the senate adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, *March* 27, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the resolutions submitted by Mr. CLAY—

Mr. CHASE resumed: If, Mr. President, the views which I submitted to the Senate yesterday are correct, there can be no foundation whatever for the doctrine advanced, and somewhat boldly of late, that an equilibrium between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding sections of our country has been, is, and ought to be, an approved feature of our political system. No such equilibrium, nothing looking towards such an equilibrium, can be found in the Constitution, nor in any early action under it. It was not thought of by anybody. On the contrary, the Constitution was formed for seven free states and six slave states, and with full knowledge, on the part of those who framed and those who adopted it, that provision had been made by the Ordinance for the erection of five additional free states out of the Northwestern Territory. It was equally well known that Vermont must soon come, and that Maine must ultimately come into the Union, and both as free states. Many expected also that Kentucky would come in as a free state. It is matter of history that a strong effort was made in the convention which framed her constitution to provide for the abolition of slavery within her limits, and that this effort came very near success. On the other hand, there is nothing in history, so far as I am aware, which gives the least support to the idea that anybody wished for the extension of slavery beyond the limits of the existing states, or for the creation of any more new slave states within those limits. But let it be conceded that it was anticipated that all the territory west of the Alleghanies and south of the Ohio would be formed into slave states, just as it has been, and where then would be the equilibrium? Four slave states—Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama—added to the six existing slave states, would make but ten; whereas the seven expected free states added to the seven existing free states, would make fourteen; thus giving to the free states, after the division of every inch of territory into states, a majority of eight in this Chamber, as well as a large majority in the other House. The truth is, sir, that this idea of an equilibrium was never started until after we began to create slave states out of territory which was alien to our original policy, and inconsistent with the interests and the duty of the country.

Nor, Mr. President, is there any better foundation for the assertion that Slavery and freedom are entitled to equal regard in the administration of this Government. The argument is, that the States are equal; that each State has an equal right with every other State to determine for itself what shall be the character of its domestic institutions; and, therefore, that every right acquired under the laws of any State must be protected and enforced in the national territories as in the States whose laws conferred it. Sir, the argument does not warrant the conclusion. It is true that the States are equal, entirely, absolutely equal; it is true that each State, except where restrained by constitutional provisions, may form its domestic institutions according to its own pleasure; but it is not true that every right derived from State law can be carried beyond the State into the territories or elsewhere; it is not true, for example, that, if a State choses to authorize slaveholding within its limits, Congress is therefore bound to authorize slaveholding in the territories. It is no more true than that a bank, chartered by the laws of a particular State, would have a right, under that law to establish branches in the territories, although the National Government might be constitutionally incompetent to legalize banking. Why, sir, Slavery depends entirely for its existence and continuance on local law. Beyond the sphere of the operation of such law, no man can be compelled to submit to the condition of a slave, except by mere unauthorized force.

I come now, Mr. President, to consider, in the light of these general principles, the particular questions under the consideration of the Senate. The honorable Senator from Kentucky has submitted to us several propositions, which mark out a general plan for the settlement of all questions growing out of the subject of Slavery. I am afraid, sir, that the plan will hardly prove comprehensive enough. If we were prepared to adopt the whole scheme, who can say that other questions and other difficulties will not arise from this prolific source of embarrassment and trouble.

The first proposition of the Senator from Kentucky relates to the admission of California. It is not now a matter of dispute whether California shall or shall not be admitted into the Union. That question is settled. No one doubts that California is to come in, with the boundaries which she claims, and with the constitution she has adopted. I concur cordially in this decision. As a western man, I should have preferred the erection of two States rather than one, out of the territory acquired from Mexico on the Pacific; and I wish also, in common with many of the most intelligent citizens of California, that her eastern boundary had been restricted to the range of the Sierra Nevada. Under existing circumstances, however, I desire to see California come in as she is, without restriction, and without delay.

But it is proposed to connect the admission of California with the general settlement of the Slavery question. It is proposed, also, since the recent report of a bill for her admission, and of a bill providing territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico, from the Committee on Territories, to give to this territorial bill precedence over the California bill. I am opposed, sir, to both of these propositions. I expect no good result in the present state of the country, from the appointment of such a committee to devise a general plan of settlement, in which the admission of California shall be included. The appointment of such an omnibus committee would excite alarm, distrust, indignation. It would not, in my judgment, inspire confidence, or command respect. The task assigned to it would be an impossible work, and membership of it an unenviable distinction. Any adjustment that it could devise would be more likely to compromise the compromisers than to restore tranquility to the country. I hope that the motion for the appointment of this committee may not be pressed. I have observed, indeed, with pleasure, some indications that it will not be pursued

But it will be insisted that the territorial bill for Utah and New Mexico shall have precedence of the California admission bill. That, sir, is an adjustment in another form. The design of it is palpable enough. It is expected that it will be easier to carry the territorial bill, without any restriction as to Slavery, before than after the admission of California. I do not know how this may be; but for one I will not consent to change the order in which the bills are reported by the committee. The country will regard, and, in my judgment, will justly regard, any change in that order postponing the California bill to the territorial bill, as a concession to the demand for the extension of Slavery over free territories. No such concession can ever receive the sanction of my vote.

Mr. FOOTE.—Will the Senator bear with me for a moment?

Mr. CHASE.—With pleasure.

Mr. FOOTE.—I did not myself hear a remark which fell from him some time since; but I understand that he is under the impression that I do not intend pressing the motion I have made for the appointment of a committee.

Mr. CHASE.—I said I hoped it might not be pressed.

Mr. FOOTE.—With the Senator's permission I will embrace the opportunity to say, and I wish it to be heard by all the Senators present, or at least by those who are favorable to the measure, that I had hoped that this day the motion would have been taken up and acted on. I am still in hopes that, after we get through this discussion, it may be acted on, if not to-day, at the earliest possible period. I deem it my duty, my most solemn duty, to press the motion most earnestly.

Mr. CHASE.—I am sorry to find, Mr President, that I have been under a misapprehension as to the Senator's intention. I do not believe that it will be esteemed, in future times, a creditable distinction to have been, in the year of grace 1850, a member of any committee, by whose intervention, or by whose non-intervention, free territory was subjected to the blight of Slavery; and unless the committee is designed to promote this object, I see no reason why its appointment should be urged.

Mr. President, the next two propositions of the Senator from Kentucky relate to the adjustment of the Texan boundary, and the assumption by the United States of the Texan debt.

It seems to me, sir, that both these questions have been brought prematurely into this discussion. I see no good reason for pressing them at this time upon the consideration of the Senate. Texas is here. Her Senators are in this Chamber; her Representatives are in the other branch of the National Legislature. She is one of the United States. It is too late to question the constitutionality of her admission. And we might well leave all questions connected with the erection of new States within her limits, the liability of the United States for her debts, and the determination of her western and northwestern boundary, to be disposed of when they arise. Not one of them is important now, except that which relates to the boundary between Texas and New Mexico; and that should be determined in a bill for the government of that territory rather than by a resolution, in forced connection with distinct matters. But as these questions are here, and have been made the subject of debate by Senators who have preceded me, I propose to state my own impressions in regard to them.

And I wish to say, in the first place that I do not doubt the constitutional power of Congress to admit Texas. The power to admit new States is conferred upon Congress by the Constitution in the broadest and most general terms. "New States may be admitted by Congress into this Union," is the language of the Constitution. Statesmen and constitutional lawyers of great eminence have denied, I am aware, that this power was designed to extend to the admission of foreign States; but I see no such limitation in the instrument myself.

But a power to admit a new State is a very different thing from a power to covenant for the future admission of other States, to be created out of the State admitted. In my judgment, the latter is as completely beyond, as the former is completely within, the powers of Congress. The question of admission must be addressed to the Congress to the which application for admission is made, and must be determined according to its own discretion, uncontrolled by any action of any preceding Congress. I do not say that Congress can propose no terms or conditions of admission, or none that will be binding. I think otherwise. I only say that one Congress cannot, upon the admission of one State, bind the discretion of a subsequent Congress in respect to the admission of other new States. This seems to me too plain for argument; but let me add a single illustration. Suppose Congress, upon the admission of a State, should agree that as soon as any district within it should contain five thousand inhabitants, it should be admitted as a State; would that stipulation bind a future Congress? I think not.

(*To be Continued.*)

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1850.

THE ANNIVERSARY.

THANKS to the *New York Herald*, the Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, held at the Tabernacle on Tuesday morning, was, by far, the most crowded, the most exciting, the most interesting, and will, without doubt, prove the most influential Anti-Slavery meeting ever yet held in this city. That excellent paper had thoroughly prepared the public mind for our reception, and even without the assistance of that portion of the citizens who are most under its control, the meeting would unquestionably have been a remarkably good one; with their aid it was absolutely triumphant. But as we mean that that portion of our readers who were so unfortunate as not to be present, shall be possessed of the whole story as far as time and space will permit us to give it to them, we shall re-echo first the notes of preparation with which the *Herald* was so kind as to herald the advent of the Anniversary. We copied last week a portion of an article on the Anniversaries in which that paper broached its plan of bringing the Anti-Slavery meetings specially before the public. That was followed by a nother on Thursday last, as follows:

Anti-Slavery Protracted Meetings.

These meetings will commence to-day, and will create a greater sensation than the protracted meetings of Dr. Finney, in this city, ten or twelve years ago, or of the jumpers in Wales, thirty years ago, when three or four thousand in an hour fell to the ground in fits, foaming at the mouth, and as mad as insanity could make them. The Anti-Slavery delegates, of every hue and of every clime, will pour in upon us by Monday, and on Tuesday they will assemble to give people a true notion of what free discussion can accomplish. They will be full of all kinds of assaults upon all kinds of decency and upon liberty itself. They will assault the people, the nation, the constitution, the representatives and the senators in Congress assembled, the President, the laws and the press. Having dealt their blows upon these, till the game is stale, they will next attack the church, then the clergy, then the Sabbath, then the Bible, then everything divine and human, throughout the the world, quarreling among themselves at a tearful rate, and possibly kicking up a disgraceful riot in order to become martyrs to their false patriotism, false pride, and sincere folly.

Such will be the plan, the plot; the scenes can as yet scarcely be sketched. The house will be an overflowing one; and if, in the rush for places, the public should become interested and get upon the stage, and turn the tables by talking down and voting down the actors, it would be a case of real free discussion—popular opinion rising superior to local prejudice, and producing a good result out of the most mischievous elements.—We shall be interested to know how this drama proceeds, and whether or not it will be in one act or more. A great deal can be done in three days. Three battles may be won in that time.

These were very well for a beginning, but were only the foreshadowing of what was to follow. Accordingly on Monday the body of the design begun to show itself more distinctly, and on that day the following article was the *Herald's* leader:

The Great Annual Convention of the Blacks and Whites—Who are the Real Disunionists?

The newspaper organ of the Abolitionists—the *Liberator*, of Boston—is out in favor of the immediate dissolution of the Union, and the abolition of Slavery. It comes boldly and manfully up to the issue. It states that "A contest of near twenty years has proved, that the only hopeful issue with Slavery is the demand for the *immediate and unconditional emancipation of every slave*," and that such a consummation can never be attained as long as the people of the free States maintain a political union with the South and the slaveholders. These doctrines are put forth as the text for the Anti-Slavery Convention of three days, to begin to-morrow. Here is the official *pronunciamento*:

This, the official call for the meeting which has stood for several weeks past in our own columns and the *Liberator*, of course, we omit. The *Herald* proceeds:

The following persons are announced as the speakers in the Tabernacle, to-morrow forenoon:

William H. Furness, of Philadelphia, white man—from Anglo-Saxon blood.

Frederick Douglass, of Rochester, black man—from African blood.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, of Boston, mulatto man—mixed race.

Wendell Phillips, of Boston, white man—merely from blood.

This anniversary, or, more properly speaking, this great convention, opposed to Slavery, and in favor of disunion, is composed of certain leading men, black, white, and mulatto, from every section of the free States—from the North, from the East, from the West, the Southwest—ay, and many, too, from the South! Talk of the danger of the Nashville Convention, where, probably, the delegates will do little more than to discuss the resources of the South, collect statistics in reference to its great products, it manufactures, its railroads, and its institutions, in a peaceable, quiet manner, and compare it with the doctrines, the treason, and the disunion that must follow in the wake of this great Northern Convention. One is as the light of the noonday sun contrasted with the darkness of a stormy midnight. Will the people of New York suffer such a convention, for such purposes, to be held in their midst, without raising their voices against its doctrines, its objects, its avowed purposes? Report says that the people of Nashville—Southern people and slaveholders—are so fearful of having a convention in their city, that may have the slightest tendency to disunion, that they oppose the comparative harmless Southern convention to be held in their city, without holding another assembly to oppose its doctrines. Shall we of the North—we of New York—be less sensitive, and permit so foul a blot upon our city—upon our love of the Union—without some expression of dissent? No, no—it cannot be. Public opinion must be expressed, and in tones and terms equal to the crisis. These meetings are to be held in our midst, and will last three days. They commence to-morrow morning, at the Tabernacle; on Wednesday and Thursday they are to be continued at the New York Society Library Rooms, No. 348 Broadway.

What would these men do? "The immediate and unconditional emancipation of every slave;" and, in order to accomplish that object, an immediate and unconditional dissolution of the Union.

The two distinct races of men, the white and the black, never yet stood side by side in a social system that can compare with the present happy relations that exist in the South. It is a spectacle which is exhibited in no other country. The one is dependent upon the other. Each belongs to, and all are parts of a peaceful system. Both are surrounded with all the comforts, conveniences—ay, luxuries, and endearments of life. Love and kindness sweeten the task of servitude, and quiet obedience and devotion lighten the tasks

section of the Union against the other, and stop the wheels of government by their insane agitation—malcontents, who find nothing honest but their own honesty, nothing sacred but their own divinity, nothing liberal but their own liberality, to the elevation and diffusion of which, all their time, talents and opportunities are directed, and directed for no good, but for the ultimate detriment of every race, and the cause of liberty throughout the world.

When free discussion does not promote the public good, it has no more right to exist than a bad government, that is dangerous and oppressive to the common weal. It should be overthrown. On the question of usefulness to the public, of the packed, organized meetings of these Abolitionists, Socialists, Sabbath-breakers and Anarchists, there can be but one result arrived at by prudence and patriotism. They are dangerous assemblies—calculated for mischief, and treasonable is their character and purposes. Though the law cannot reach them, public opinion can; and, as in England a peaceful dissent from such doctrines as these fellows would promulgate—a strong expression of dissent from them—would be conveyed by hisses and by counter statements and expositions, so here in New York we may anticipate that there are those who will enter the arena of discussion, and send out the true opinion of the public. That half a dozen madmen should manufacture opinion for the whole community is not to be tolerated. It is to be hoped, that before long, we shall learn what public opinion upon the Union, truly is—and what interest all the masses have in the perpetuity of the Sabbath and our institutions.

Such was the preparation made for the meeting, and what was likely to be the result it was easy to conjecture if one believed the *Herald's* power of doing mischief was equal to its will. That it was, however, we did not believe, though we by no means regretted that it should do its very worst, by the most infamous means, to arouse against us all there might be of pro-slavery feeling, and of the spirit of violence existing among the most hardened desperadoes of the 'hells' of Park Row, and the denizens of the grog-shops around Tammany Hall. If a mob could not be aroused by such appeals now, it would seem to settle the question that the day of pro-slavery mobs in this city was over; for we may, at least, hope that so favorable a time for such a demonstration against the Anti-Slavery cause will never again occur when as at this moment, whatever spirit the pro-slavery party can command is fully developed by the discussions for months past in Congress, and out of it, and by the positions which leading Northern men, in the Senate and House, and leading politicians everywhere have assumed It was a desperate venture on the part of the *Herald* and its friends. Even their gain could not be altogether our loss, but their loss must be to us a gain almost incalculable. It was gratifying, moreover, to observe, that, with a single exception, the press of the city was altogether silent on this premeditated and appointed mob of the *Herald's*, though, to the shame of all others of the daily papers, one only, the *Express*, had the manliness and courage to deprecate the proposed outrage upon good order and peace and the rights of the citizens to Assemble and discuss a question which the Legislative assembly of the nation has done nothing but discuss for the last five months. To the *Express* let due credit be given, and to the *Globe*, also, which, on Thursday morning, thus contributed its little might to the *Herald's* object. In copying this article we give it the benefit of its own Italics and Capitals:

THE ANTI-SLAVERY ANNIVERSARY—We know not, neither is it important to know, who is the writer of the article which we extract from the *Herald* of yesterday, on the subject of the protracted meetings to be held here to take incipient steps for the dissolution of the Union of this glorious Republic; but we do know that the writer sees and understands the object of the society and of the moving spirits who are to figure at the Tabernacle and the Library; and we join most heartily in the denunciation of the TREASON and TRAITORS. The right to assemble peaceably for the overthrow of the Government is nowhere guaranteed by the Constitution, though for the redress of grievances such assembling of the people is constitutional, and we hold every man who aids and abets the avowed object of "immediate and unconditional emancipation" of the slaves of the Union, to be a *traitor* at *heart*, unworthy to enjoy the liberty achieved by our fathers. A traitor not only to the country, but to the very blood whence he derived his right to his own freedom—a traitor to that instrument which never could have been framed had such a spirit as now prevails in this Anti-Slavery Society governed the councils of the men who framed it. The meetings must not be held, even though Van Buren himself should bring the Buffalo Platform here for a seat on which he would preside over the orgies which must follow such gatherings.

No public building, no, not even the streets, must be desecrated by such a proposed assemblage of *traitors*.

One of the heralded orators for this Anniversary, is the black Douglass, who, at a public meeting, at Syracuse, on the 15th January, 1850, uttered the following infamous exclamation:

"LET THE UNION BE DISSOLVED. I WISH TO SEE IT DISSOLVED AT ONCE—talk to me of the love of Liberty of your WASHINGTONS, JEFFERSONS and HENRYS—THEY WERE STRANGERS TO ANY JUST IDEA OF LIBERTY."!!!

This was uttered, says a cotemporary, and "no hand was raised to fell the speaker to the earth!"

And this is the man who dares to appear in this city to preach rebellion to the slaves of the South, and we are expected to protect him under that clause of the Constitution which permits the peaceable assembling of the people to *petition* for the redress of grievances.

What grievances of Slavery exist now, that did not exist when the Constitution was adopted?

When the Constitution was adopted, Slavery existed in full force, and was not included among the grievances contemplated to be abated by Congress, much less by the people *en masse*—and still less by the people o *one section* of the Union, in defiance of the *vested rights of another section*.

If this Douglass shall re-proclaim his Syracuse treason here, and any man shall arrest him in his diabolical career, and not injure him, thousands will exclaim in language of patriotic love for the Constitution and the rights of the south, "DID HE NOT STRIKE THE VILLAIN DEAD?"

At the appointed time, on Thursday morning, the Convention assembled, and, after the usual preliminary proceedings, the floor was taken by Mr. Garrison. We observed at the outset, on the skirts of the assembly, and in the rising seats behind the platform, and commanding a view of the whole audience, a number of the desperate and hard-looking characters which are the material of which mobs are made. There was, however, for some time, no demonstration of violence. Mr. Garrison held the audience in fixed attention, as he proceeded, in his clear and ringing voice, to enunciate the truths of Anti-Slavery, and which no man can set forth in more forcible terms, and in clearer logical sequence, than he. The *Herald's* gang—not for the last time that day, as the sequel proved—were fairly mystified. Here was a flight above the Tammany Hall harangues, with which the ears of these groundlings were accustomed to be split, and at which they are used to throw up their 'greasy caps' and utter 'such a deal of stinking breath.' The speaker was altogether above the level of their comprehension. They could not understand enough even to raise a hiss, much less an objection, till a charge of the sin of Slavery and slaveholding was made against the Catholic Church. Then came a question. CAPTAIN RYNDERS—good, pious soul!—was scandalised at an attack upon the Mother Church. Why, he asked, were the Catholics singled out as alone guilty in this matter? So tremendous a home-thrust was received with a storm of applause from his followers, and the speaker could not, for some moments, secure attention to his asseveration that he, by no means, meant to be partial, but that he should be equally sweeping in his charges, and equally severe, against the other churches of the country, ere he should finish. He proceeded in his analysis. The Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, each in turn passed in brief review before him, and with them the whole religion of the land, with all its dogmas and its observances. But the indignant Catholics of a moment since were changed, almost in the twinkling of an eye, certainly in the rounding of a period, from Catholics to Churchmen, from Churchmen to Presbyterians, from Presbyterians to Baptists, in turn to devout persons of all sects, indeed to religious men of an altogether heterogenous and quite impartial character, ready to defend religion in the general, and protest against that impiety which could find in slaveholding any offence against Christianity. And the manner of the protestation was quite worthy of the protestants. Screams and cat-calls, oaths and howls, manifested their pious zeal and earnestness in behalf of the Church; and it was very evident that it only needed that there should be some, to them, tangible point presented, something which they might be absolutely certain they understood, to bring them down like an army of crusaders upon the heathen and fanatics whom they surrounded.

The opportunity was not long wanting. Mr. Garrison alluded to the character of the great men of the nation, and the assertion of their pro-slavery character. This, Capt. Rynders - being himself a distinguished party leader—felt called upon to repel more distinctly and unequivocally than any other that had yet been offered. Here was a subject that was not altogether unknown in Tammany Hall, that was not 'canaire to the vulgar,' and the truculent Rynders at once declared that neither his country, its laws, its President, its Constitution, nor its institutions, should be spoken evil of; the company that surrounded him backed the assertion by various demonstrations of hostility, and the whole gang poured down upon and covered the platform, like a flock of unclean birds settling upon some fallen animal which they believe is dead, or about to die. A row, apparently, was inevitable. The desperate blackguards were full of fight, and only wanted the smallest provocation to fall pell mell upon any body and every body within their reach. Such is the way of a New York mob, and it is not easy to calculate the power for mischief of an organized band of only 50 men, but this—for this was *the* New York mob, the rioters of Astor Place, the Bowdies of Tammany, the friends, in short, of Bennett—this had met with an opponent hitherto unknown, and undreamed of in their philosophy. They encountered men who would'n't fight! To their utter discomfiture they red with rage, and redolent of rum, stood face to face with men as calm as a summer morning, and no more drunk than they were angry. There is no getting to fisticuffs with a man who carries his hands in his pockets and a smile on his face. Rynders at first singled out Garrison, expecting, probably, to settle the matter as other great questions have been settled in other and chivalric times, by a battle of leaders. The Pioneer was as good as challenged to a round or two of pugilistic encounter with no less a man than the said Captain Isaiah Rynders, in defence of the various heresies of the Society, on whose platform they stood! But the Pioneer wasn't game and wouldn't fight. Instead of that, he proposed talking, and offered full liberty of that to the opposite party

A good deal of confusion, several attempts to make a beginning of the fighting, yells, vociferations, grand and lofty tumblings by Rynders, and extravagances of various sorts by his party, continued for some time, uninfluenced by the singing of Hutchinsons, who poured the oil of song upon the ocean of discord, and unchecked by the Police who stood quietly by, protecting, if not encouraging, the mob; Mr Leonard, one of the Captains of Police, declaring to the writer of this statement—who required him to arrest Rynders as a rioter—not only that he would not arrest any one unless a positive assault were committed, but that Rynders and his people were committing no offence, and that they had a right to do and say what pleased them, this being a free meeting. It is only just, however, to Mr. Matsell, the Chief of Police, to say that, at a latter stage of the proceedings, he said to the chairman that Rynders should be arrested the moment he expressed a wish to have it done, a service the Chairman, being a non-resistant, declined, and which, fortunately for the indomitable Captain, this present writer did not hear of till after the meeting, otherwise the city would have been at the expense of that gentleman's board and lodging for a few hours.

But that neither Garrison, Francis Jackson, Isaac T. Hopper, nor any other of the persons no the platform would strip for a knock-down was a notion that at length made its way through Rynder's hair, and gradually into the souls of his followers. They looked down upon them with concentrated rage and scorn, but the fact remained the same, not a fight could be had. They were on the very eve of a most ignominious defeat in spite of the countenance of Police Capt. Raymond, when a tall and quite seedy looking individual with one hand tied in a not very clean piece of cotton cloth, rushed to the rescue. He thought himself quite competent to do the talking, and by talking it was clear the matter had to be settled. He was accepted as the champion of the losing party, perhaps partly because it was Hobson's choice with them, and partly because talking rationally was a thing as easy, and no easier, than flying. Indeed none of them did or would attempt any thing much beyond the mere articulate brute sounds with which on all such occasions they prove their affinity with other animals, except Capt. Rynders, and he is so little removed from a complete jackass that his friends are no doubt aware of his incompetency as a speech-making or rational being. Order at length being in some measure restored, Mr. Garrison finished his speech with only occasional interruptions, it being understood that Mr. Grant should have the right of reply.

Mr. Furness, however, followed Mr. Garrison immediately. His friends may perhaps have felt that a clergyman entirely unaccustomed to public speaking except in the repose of a Sabbath meeting would hardly do himself justice when surrounded in a popular assembly by such distracting and tumultuous elements. The first tones of his voice, however, the self-possession of his manner, the firmness of his stand, and the perfect ease of his whole bearing, must have dispelled, in a moment, any such apprehension. Had he done nothing for the last dozen years but lecture on Slavery, and been accustomed to such scenes every month, he could not have better apprehended the relations in which he stood. The speech in itself was a most chaste and finished production, as full of beauty as it was of truth, but through the purity and elegance of its diction, and its clearness of thought, shone the beauty and truth of its spirit, and the influence which went out from the speaker diffused itself almost at once over the whole assembly, falling like healing balm upon a recent wound, penetrating like pleasant sunlight into dark places, descending like summer showers on a hot and a parched and perishing earth. It reached even the rude men who stood ready to assail the meeting, and magnetised them into quiet, though its words of wisdom so simply and so clearly expressed could not probably penetrate to their dull brains. It turned altogether the current of the meeting, or rather sent onward with resistless force the current already turned.

And then came Mr. Grant. He prides himself evidently on being 'nothing if not critical,' and the audience were inclined to take him at this valuation, and decided unequivocally that he was not the latter. His speech was meant to be replete with scientific lore, with comparative anatomy, and analytical science, but did not seem to be altogether satisfactory to his client Rynders, who could very easily understand, if he understood nothing else, from the peals of laughter with which the audience greeted the orator, that they very speedily decided that he was making a tool of himself, and that if he was as lond as a drum—which went for much with the 'boys' at the outset—that he was also as empty. He began with a theory of man's nervous centre,—which he was good enough to tell his hearers they probably did not understand—and then deduced, through bivalves, and univalves, vertebræ, the *genus homo*, and elliptical tibiæ, that the negro was nearly allied to the Chimpanzee, and therefore not being a white man, was necessarily and properly a slave. He reminded us of Dumas' reply to the impertinent fellow who inquired of his descent, and who was informed that his (Dumas') grandfather was a monkey—his race having commenced where the inquirer's ended The audience were evidently of our way of thinking.

Next Mr. Douglass took the platform, and though, for a moment, there was some fear for his personal safety among those who had seen the *Globe's* atrocious proposition for his assassination, it was in a moment dispelled. He was, he said, one of those whose lineage the preceding speaker had been tracing, and offered himself there to the inspection of the audience to decide whether or not he was a man. "Ah!" shouted Rynders, who stood beside him, and who, it should be stated, had taken that conspicuous position when he thought the meeting was his, and remained in it, too mortified even to creep away when he found it was somebody's else—"ah!" said he, "but you are not a negro!" "Then," replied Mr. Douglass, turning upon him with the blandest of smiles, and an almost affectionate obeisance, "I am half brother to Captain Rynders!" The retort was as unexpected as it was happy, and completed the entire defeat of the Rynders party. But Mr. Douglass did not stop here. In the same bland and gentle manner he gave utterance to retort after retort, and sarcasm after sarcasm, all with such perfect good nature, and inimitable humor, as was perfectly irresistible, and left no longer a question in the minds of the hearers, which of these individuals who stood in conspicuous positions before them—Grant, Rynders, and Douglass—was most likely to have had a Chimpanzee for a grandfather. Rynderr, however, to do him justice, behaved as well as could be expected under the circumstances. His laugh at Douglass' wit was the loudest, and his applause at the eloquence he was listening to the most uproarious, though we have no sort of doubt that he would have been thankful any time during the last hour of the meeting, if Captain Raymond had only done as he was required and had lodged him safely in the Tombs.

But his torment was not yet over. Douglass called out his friend Ward, who came forward as an unexceptionable specimen of the race whom Mr. Grant would have it should be slaves because their hair does not change color in the sun. In the whole country a colored man could not have been found more offensive to the Rynders party than Douglass, whom they were compelled, in spite of themselves, to applaud to the skies instead of beating to the earth. The cruelty to these animals was made the keener by bringing before them now as black a man as could be found in the world, who might stand as the original 'nigger' whom American Democracy so loathes and hates. Him also they were constrained to applaud, in obedience to the overwhelming sentiment of the meeting, so complete was the refutation which his speech, brief, but pertinent, and admirably calculated for the occasion, made of the spirit and position which actuated these contemners and enemies of his race.

The meeting here adjourned to meet again in the afternoon, entirely satisfied, thus far, with Mr. Bennett's efforts in its behalf, and not ungrateful to Captain Rynders and his friends for the spectacle they had made of themselves for the amusement of the public.

P. S. While this article has been in the hands of the printers the meetings of the Society have been in session at the Society Library, and now (Wednesday noon) have been compelled to adjourn. The final triumph of the mob does not militate against the above statement of their defeat at the Tabernacle nor does their success in completely breaking up the meetings compel us to qualify our assertion that this Anniversary has done more than any other that has ever been held for the Anti-Slavery cause. The mob has triumphed, not over us, but over the city authorities, and prostrated again, as they did in Astor Place, just a year ago, the cause of peace and good government. For this the citizens may thank their Mayor who is not inclined to have the opportunity again of even running away from another riot. The Police, at the outset, could have easily put an end to the disorder, but refused to do so. The meeting in the afternoon continued without interruption, but in the evening was clamored down by the outrageous conduct of the miscreants of the morning, reinforced by a large number of their kind. The same scenes were renewed this (Wednesday) morning, the police being present in strong force, but with strict orders from Mayor Woodhull that they should not interfere except in case of violent assault.—This, of course, was a promise of perfect impunity to the mob so long as it refrained from destroying property, breaking bones, and shedding blood. That such would have been the final result is more than probable had the meetings continued, and under such circumstances the proprietors of the building, responsible for the safety of a large and valuable public Library in their care, did not feel justified in permitting the continuance of the meetings in that place. The members of the Anti-Slavery Society acquiesced without hesitation in their view of the propriety of a final adjournment and left the hall at 12 1-2 o'clock on Wednesday, BECAUSE THE RIGHT IS DENIED THEM OF PUBLICLY ASSEMBLING TOGETHER TO DISCUSS A GRAVE MOMENTOUS MORAL QUESTION, AND BECAUSE THE CITY AUTHORITIES OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK REFUSED TO SUPPRESS A RIOT WHICH JEOPARDED A VALUABLE PUBLIC LIBRARY, AND THE BUILDING THAT CONTAINED IT, AND THREATENED THE LIVES OF THE CITIZENS.

ARREST FOR MISDEMEANOR.—A black fellow named Benjamin Bates alias Wm. Johnson, was arrested on Saturday night by officer Wilson of the Fifteenth Ward, charged with sending an indecent letter to Mrs. Phebe Carleton, confectioner of No. 86 Bleeker st. The letter was placed by Mrs. Carleton in the hands of the officer who caught the rascal on the corner of Broadway and Bleecker st. about 10 o'clock on Saturday night, where he was expecting to meet Mrs. C., according to an appointment made in his communication. He was taken before Justice McGrath and locked up to answer.—*Morning Paper.*

Very well. Now if our diligent police will arrest all the *white* rascals who are guilty of similar misdemeanors, what a pattern community we should be. Of course this can only be a beginning to proceed against all the villains, without regard to color, who are in the habit of insulting women.

THE CINCINNATI CONVENTION.—We have seen no report of the recent Convention in Cincinnati called to consider the relation and the duty of the churches to the system of Slavery, but we gather something of its spirit from the following resolution passed by it, and which we find in an exchange paper:

Resolved, That the friends of a pure Christianity ought to separate themselves from all slaveholding churches, and all churches, ecclesiastical bodies, and missionary associations, that are not fully divorced from slaveholding; and we who may still be in connection with such bodies, pledge ourselves to separate from them, unless they will speedily separate themselves from all support of, or fellowship with, slaveholders.

THE NEW ENGLAND METHODIST CONFERENCE ON SLAVERY.—The New England Methodist Conference, which was in session last week at Boston, passed the following Resolutions on Slavery. They might serve as an excellent pattern for other ecclesiastical bodies, and we trust that the New England Methodists will so act up to their spirit that their conduct, in this matter, shall be a reproach to their brethren in other churches:

Resolved, That while we feel humbled by the continued existence of Slavery with its wickedness and abominations, we rejoice in the increasing evidence that it is not now chiefly contemplated in political or fiscal connections, but that the moral sentiments of the nation are being aroused against it, and the true principle of freedom with reference to the rights of all men are being rapidly and generally diffused.

Resolved, That we believe the day will come when the moral reprobation of the world will rest on this evil, and men will regard Slavery and its supporters with all the abhorrence with which they look on the tribunals and dungeons of the Inquisition, and the vilest forms of oppression which have existed in past ages.

Resolved, That it is our duty as Christians, on all proper occasions, to protest against that low standard of morality that sanctions the settlement of any difficulties by a compromise of moral principles, and that it is our duty to maintain the cause of justice and the oppressed, and leave the results with God.

Resolved, That Christians cannot consistently give their influence to elevate men to places of honor and trust who are known to be supporters of any great social and moral evil.

Resolved, That the glory of God and the good of mankind require the exclusion of Slaveholders from the Christian Church.

☞ A Washington correspondent of one of the city papers says that a new paper is about to be established there, to be devoted to the ultra Slavery interest. A happy choice of an editor is made in the notorious renegade Quaker, Ellwood Fisher.

To Correspondents.

E. G. Package at 21 Cornhill.

J. R. L. Will also find a package for him at *The Liberator* office.

Foreign Correspondence.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, April 4th, 1850.

MY DEAR GAY: It is a long time since I wrote to you, but, as I have not heard you make any complaints, I trust you have borne the deprivation with due philosophy. Now that winter is over, I begin to open my eyes like other hybernating animals. Better not to write at all, than to set your victim asleep with your stupidity; and in this conviction I preferred being silent when I had nothing to say.

My attention has been of late directed to the subject of emigration to America, in consequence of the intended removal to Ohio of an old and intimate friend and his family, whom I lately visited in Liverpool. We hear with comparative indifference of the removal of hundreds and thousands who are unknown to us; but when this great change is undertaken by near and dear relations or friends, it becomes deeply interesting and important to us. My friend has enjoyed, for many years, a high reputation for integrity and ability as a teacher in Liverpool. But teaching is an arduous and generally an ill paid profession; and it is difficult to secure thereby even a moderate competency for declining years. My friend hopes, with the means he possesses, to enjoy in America the pleasures and advantages of a country life, with chances for putting his children forward in the world, which would certainly be unattainable in highly taxed England.

Were I an American citizen, I should think it wise to welcome and encourage a class of emigrants superior to that which lands in such vast multitudes upon your shores. The vast influx of uneducated, untrained people, like the majority of those who go from Ireland, can add but little strength to their adopted country. They are generally like clay in the hands of their priests and of interested demagogues. I shall be surprised if the Romish priesthood do not, ere long, become formidable in the United States by the possession of great political influence. Again, our poor people are full of intense (and not entirely unreasonable) hostility to England. But, whatever may have been the misdeeds of England against you or against us, in past ages, the continuance of national antipathies is, by all means, to be deprecated. It is not well for America that so large a proportion of those who seek the shelter of her shores should be ready to adopt the prejudices of their new country—better that they should be able to think for themselves, and act up to their own convictions.

We hear constantly of the tyranny of public opinion amongst you. In these countries, society is divided into classes or castes, each almost independent of the opinion of the others. The working classes are influenced by a set of notions, maxims and fashions, hardly known to their employers; and so of the rest. I may not with impunity set at defiance the public opinion of the class or caste to which I belong; but those above or below me neither know nor care much about me. But with you, these social distinctions do not exist, and the whole community brings the weight of its displeasure to bear upon the utterers of obnoxious sentiments. When Garrison stood forth to do battle with Slavery, the nation was against him; all classes were alarmed. The mammon worshipper, the politician, the priest, all trembled for their glass-houses when he began to throw stones. Above all living men and women, I honor the *lapwater* Abolitionists, for they have shown the noblest moral courage, the truest perception of truth and justice, and this in the teeth of twenty millions of opponents, who, as far as they can be judged by their public acts, are more eager for the maintenance and propagation of Slavery than for any thing else. When the cowardly war of England against China, and the shameful invasion of Afghanistan, were carried on, a large proportion of the English people were dissentient; but if the national voice had been as stongly expressed against these national iniquities as it would have been against an unpopular tax, such outrages against God and man would never hav been persisted in. Therefore, I hold the English nation responsible for them. In like manner, when I find that ninety-nine out of every hundred Americans "dislike slavery as much as any body," but are furiously angry with any one who attempts to prove his abhorrence by his actions, I am justified in bringing my accusation against them also.

Were it not that the Abolitionists express such confidence in the progress and prospects of the cause, I should feel somewhat discouraged by the evident disposition of the North to concede every thing to the South, in her terror at the cry of "The Union is in danger."

Though a constant reader of the Refuge of Oppression and whatever pro-slavery literature I can lay my hands on, I am never done wondering that the Americans make such an idol of their constitution, that they are always ready to fall down and worship it, no matter how cruel and debasing its requisitions may be. I often think of a remark which I heard many years ago in the Egyptian Saloon of the British Museum. This lofty and spacious apartment is filled with the spoils of the remotest antiquity, venerable and serene sculpture, grotesque idols, tombs and coffins of colossal proportions. (By the bye, what a paradise for the dead was ancient Egypt. As soon as you died, no matter how you might have been snubbed in your lifetime, you were sure to be filled to repletion with all good things, spices and condiments—all hot!) Well, as I was going to say, Lucretia Mott (it was at the time of the World's Convention, in 1840) observed that when we wonder how any body could ever have been so ridiculous as to worship such frights, we forget that idols just as preposterous are now devoutly worshipped. And this is true. In England, royalty and aristocracy are more fervently worshipped by vast multitudes than is their Creator. In France, they sacrifice to Military Glory. In Ireland, the Romish Priests are the representatives and exponents of Deity, and a pretty job they make of it. In the United States, National glorification, the Constitution, the Union, the Almighty Dollar and Slavery, absorb the honors. In Scotland, Whiskey. In Naples, the Pope. In Russia, the Emperor. Altogether, I suppose the idols are quite as abundant as ever, and as abominable as of old, but not always so tangible.

I told you I was in Liverpool lately. Thence I went on to London, about business, and visited Bristol, Birmingham and Derby on my way back. In London I spent an evening in company with a literary countryman of yours, who called Horace Greeley a red-hot Abolitionist, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison a mad fool. I urged him to state the grounds of this compliment to Garrison, on the plea that he was a friend of mine, and that I always liked to be sure of the character of my friends. He replied that he did not know Mr. G. personally, but he knew he was "no gentleman"—that many estimable people had told him things respecting Mr. G. which he was not going to repeat, but which were most discreditable to him, and so forth. I reminded him that some estimable people are liable to be led astray by their passions and prejudices—that I knew Mr. G. was an unpopular man at home on account of his war against American Slavery, and it was, therefore, but natural that he should be maligned and abused. I told him I had been a diligent reader of libels against Mr. Garrison, but that my personal knowledge compelled me to discredit the libels. He seemed uncomfortable, but continued to assure me that Mr. G. was "no gentleman," and was doing his best to deluge the land with blood, though he frankly admitted that he was well known as a non-resistant. He ended with the usual doughface formula, that he was a Northern man, and "as much opposed to slavery as any body."

I had seen the Panorama of the Mississippi, by Risley and Smith, in Dublin; and while in London, I visited Banvard's rival exhibition. It is due to them both to say that the exhibitors of both pictures are anxious to point out a slave's holiday, the pleasure and leisure the slaves enjoy, the comfortable and cleanly huts they inhabit, and the Arcadian lives they live. Not a syllable about paddles, fetters or cowhides, and the embrocation of salt and turpentine to the bloody back, or the enforced ignorance and immorality of the slave, or the tyranny and sensuality of the master. A relation of mine very innocently exhorted Risley or Smith to to state in public some wholesome truths about slavery. He was frankly told that they dare not do so, for what would be said to them when they went back? Thus the American slaveholders and the Russian Emperor contrive to maintain a wholesome terror in their subjects who travel into foreign parts.

Yours truly, RICH'D D. WEBB.

General Intelligence.

An Irishman, named Isaac Curry, has been held to bail at Fredericksburg, Va. for circulating Abolition Documents.

HON. GEO FOLSOM, of this City, it is announced, has been nominated by the President for Charge d' Affaires to the Hague, (Holland,) vice Maj. Auguste Davezac, recalled.

Three gentlemen, residents of Mountjoy, Lancaster country, Pa., died suddenly last week of a disease similar to Asiatic cholera.

The Spirits have appeared at Barnsville, Conn., and have commenced throwing silver spoons at a Mr. Mathews. He says he has no objections to the knockings, if they will only throw five more and make up the set.

M. Bodisco, the Russian Minister has arrived at Washington. He expresses himself (says the Evening Post) as having been not a little amused at the fiction, started awhile ago, by one of the letter writers, that he had been sent off an exile to Siberia.

Mr. Bullock, the late cashier of the Savannah Bank, Georgia, who absconded with about $125,000, nearly four months since, was brought to this city on board the Cambria, which arrived yesterday, in custody of officer Butman. This defaulter had made good his escape to England on board the British schooner Abel, but was preceded by Butman, by whom he was arrested on his landing. $5,000 reward was offered for his arrest.

ILLNESS OF THE POET WORDSWORTH.—A private letter from Ambleside, of March 25, informs the *New-York Literary World* of the dangerous illness of the poet Wordsworth: "Before you receive this," is the language of the letter, "Mr. Wordsworth will have recovered or died—he is very ill to-day, and it is my impression that we are to lose him soon." The poet was born on the 7th of April, 1770, consequently he would complete his *eightieth* year this present month.

TELEGRAPH FROM THE ATLANTIC TO CALIFORNIA.—Mr. O'Reilly announces in the St. Louis Republican, a project of a telegraph line from that city to San Francisco. He proposes that the Government shall establish a line of stockades at suitable distances all along the route, which serve as telegraph stations, and at the same time afford protection to emigrants to California, and facilitate the tranmission of the mail. Beyond this, he asks no aid from the Government.

THE END OF THE DIFFICULTY.—The puddlers and boilers of the iron establishments at Pittsburgh have brought their "strike" and all its threatening shows to a termination, by accepting the reduced rates which the pressure of the times compelled the employers to limit them to. While they have been standing out, however, others, and equally good workmen, have stepped into their places, and the consequence is, that but very few of them will be able to obtain employment, and must go elsewhere to seek it.—*Philadelphia paper.*

A MODEST YANKEE.—The following unique petition was gravely presented in the Massachusetts Legislature lately, and referred:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:—Sirs: I wish to have my name changed to that of Franklin Macy, instead of Stephen Macy, being a relative of the illustrious Dr. Franklin, and having *a mind like his*.

"Which your petitioner will ever pray.

STEPHEN MACY."

The petition was accompanied by historical vouchers of the petitioner's relationship, extracted from Folger's almanac.

THE NICARAUGA TREATY—AUTHENTIC.

Washington, April 27, 1850

As it is now beyond doubt that the Nicarauga Treaty will be ratified by a full, if not unanimous vote of the Senate, I am enabled to give you an authentic synopsis of its provisions. What I shall give embraces everything, except minor and unimportant details.

The Treaty exempts the whole of Central America, including the State of Honduras, Guatemalas, San Salvador, Nicaraugua, and the entire Mosquito coast, from the dominion and control of any foreign power. This comprises the whole region, extending through the Isthmus, which divides North from South America, a distance of from 10 to 1200 miles.

It provides for the protection of the canal from San Juan de Nicaraugua to such point on the Pacific coast as the company may select.

It invites the protection of all other nations which may be friendly to either of the two great contracting Powers; viz: Great Britain and the United States.

All nations shall enjoy the use of the canal upon payment of the same tolls, and such tolls shall be reasonable.

Protection may be withdrawn in case of extortion, or unjust discrimination in favor of one nation over another.

No nation shall be permitted the use of the canal without first joining the guaranty of protection.

The local governments in the vicinity of the canal upon the Isthmus are required to join in this guarranty of protection.

Free Ports are to be established at the terminus upon either ocean—and no duties may be collected by any nation upon merchandize being transported through the canal under any pretence whatever.

IN TIME OF WAR NO VESSEL SHALL BE DETAINED UNDER BLOCKADE.

All other routes, including the Tehuantepec route and other projects now in contemplation, or which shall originate hereafter under proper regulations, shall be protected and recognized by all nations on the same terms.

The capitalists who may be engaged in any or all of these routes, shall be protected until their completion, and forever thereafter, by all nations who are, or shall become, parties to this international compact.

Thus the independence and peace of Central America is guaranteed for ever, by all of the great leading powers known to civilization; and for this independence she is indebted to the American Republic.

It will be remembered by all who know anything of English policy in Central America, that great concessions from that Government were necessary to the formation of such a treaty as this.

Her possessory rights over different portions of that large and, in many respects, valuable territory, (as it furnishes choice woods, as mahogany, and other kinds, as well as other productions,) extend back more than a century. All of these rights, with the exception of her little ancient colony of the Belise, which is about 800 miles distant from the proposed canal, she has surrendered.—*Baltimore Patriot.*

ASYLUM FOR INEBRIATES.—Doctor Warren, of Boston, has addressed a letter to Amasa Walker, Esq., a member of the Legislature of Massachusetts, expressing his approbation of the plan for establishing an asylum for inebriates.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR MISSIONS.—The joint meeting of the Board of Managers of the Methodist Missionary Society with the General Missionary committee, was held in this city on the 3d instant. It was determined that the appropriations for 1850 should be $150 000, viz:

For Missions in Foreign Fields.....$64,200
" " " Domestic work.....85,800

LAFAYETTE'S PASSAGE TO THIS COUNTRY NOT PAID FOR.—The fling to which Mr. Bayley, in the House of Representatives, descended, at the motives of Mr. Grinnell in setting on foot an expedition to search for Sir John Franklin, has brought to light a fact not very creditable to Congress or the country. Mr. B. said the whole affair was a scheme to "get up a little glory,"—and added that it was so with those who brought Lafayette to this country. Mr. Francis Allen, who commanded the *Cadmus*, the vessel in which Lafayette came over, has published a card, branding this aspersion as gratuitous and false. He says that he did not seek the opportunity to tender the ship, but was in a position which would compel him to do so or refuse a passage wholly. Congress *voted a free passage to Lafayette,—but have never to this day paid for it!* A bill has twice passed the Senate, indemnifying the owners in part for the loss they sustained, but it has always failed in the House.—Congress, it seems, understands "getting up a little glory" at the expense of private citizens.—*Courier and Enquirer.*

MURDER IN TEXAS BY SLAVES FROM MARYLAND.—The *Wesleyan* (Houston, Texas) *Banner*, of the 17th ult, furnishes the following narrative of a most revolting murder:

RUTERSVILLE, April 10.—About a year or more ago, G. Hayden brought from Maryland four negro men, belonging to a Mr. Goodwin, to this country; and the negroes have repeatedly said that they were only to stay here so long as Hayden lived. Mr. Hayden was opening a new farm on the Navidad, and had rented some land about three miles from his new place. On Thursday, the 4th instant, being somewhat indisposed, he left two of the negroes and a German and went to his camp.

That night two of them, Moses and Bob, went to his camp Both knocked him in the head with a maul and then dragged him out to the fire and tried to burn him up, and succeeded in burning his legs off above the knees. Finding this process slow, Bob took him back and put him in the camp (which was made of plank) and set fire to it, entirely consuming his body. Moses and Bob are in irons here.

The third boy disclosed the affair on the examination today. Bob confessed the crime to him.

SLAVE SUITS.—We cut the following from the *Cass Co.* (Mich.) *Advocate*.

Mr. Pratt, of Marshall, Attorney for the Kentucky Plaintiffs in six separate suits against seven of our citizens, cause of action for having a sympathizing heart, and for desiring to see all men have their natural and legal rights according to the laws of the land, is here taking testimony. Mr. Pratt brought with him D. D. Hughes, a Commissioner to take affidavits, &c. who resides in the village of of Marshall, who acted as Mr. Pratt's clerk in the Marshall Slave case, in taking the testimony in and perhaps out of Court. The persons chosen defendants from whom money is demanded to satisfy the plaintiffs, not for any violation of law, nor for any wrong which they have done in the sight of God or man, are among our best and most worthy citizens: they all, except two, belong to the Society of Friends, who are universally admitted to be a quiet and law-abiding people. This is not one among the number who would do a wrong that good might come.

LONGEVITY.—The *Meredith Bridge Gazette* states that there are now living in the town of Northfield, N. H. nearly sixty persons, whose individual ages exceed 70 years. Eleven of this number reside in one school district, and within one mile of each other. Of the eleven, several are more than 80 years old—one is between ninety and a hundred, a hale hearty old man as can be found anywhere, and bids fair to live to see a century or more. This old gentleman is in the habit of walking to Sanbornton Bridge, a distance of two miles, as often as once a week, and is able to perform considerable labor on the farm. Another old veteran, 87 years old, is apparently as active and smart as many men at 30. He has attended the annual town meetings and cast his favorite ticket for sixty years in succession.

ICARIAN COLONY.—The Icarian Community have purchased the extensive steam flouring mill and distillery, located at this city, which they are fitting up in a superior style, with a view of doing a large business; not only for their own consumption, but for the public. In connection with this mill, they are about constructing a saw-mill, for preparing all the timbers necessary for the rebuilding of the temple, and the immediate commencement of the work. In the temple, when finished, they intend to settle their schools, when they will be enabled to admit American children, in order that the children of the various nations may become used to fraternize together, and learn their mutual languages from one another.—*Nauvoo Patriot.*

CUBA—ANOTHER FLASH IN THE PAN.—The second "Cuban Expedition" seems to have come to about as complete a fizzle out as the second "Hartford (*Nashville*) Convention." Some of the volunteers who went from Louisville in the character of "emigrants" for California, as well as some of those who went from Cincinnati, have returned home disappointed and disgusted. Others of the men who were congregated secretly in New Orleans, have in reality taken passage for the land of gold, and still others remain in suspense there, not knowing what to do. The temper of the Kentucky volunteers, who have returned after spending all their means in going to New Orleans and remaining there for weeks, may be judged from the following remark of the *Louisville Courier*: "They are very indignant with Gen. Lopez, and if they could have found him, he would doubtless have suffered some, for so grossly deceiving them."

What connection there may be between this second break-down and the report by letters from New York that Government agents in that city had discovered and seized a large quantity of arms and ammunition stowed away in a suspicious quarter, and "supposed to have been destined for Cuba" via the North River, the Lakes and the Mississippi, does not yet appear.—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

THE EXECUTION AT PATERSON.—A private note from Paterson, New Jersey, informs us that Johnson, the murderer of Judge Van Winkle, of the Goffle, was executed at that place yesterday, about one o'clock. The execution took place within the jail yard, yet there were thousands of persons collected on the outside, and some eight or ten hundred within. "It seemed, says our informant, "more like a gala-day, a general training, or a pinxter-festival, than like a solemn ceremony in vindication of the law. There was

Miscellany.

The following Report of the late Woman's Convention in Ohio, which we find in the *Tribune*, and presume to be made by our friend Oliver Johnson, will prove of interest to most of our readers, whether approving of the object of the Convention or not, from the fact that many persons connected with it are well known and highly esteemed among the larger portion of them:

THE RIGHTS OF WOMAN.

GREAT CONVENTION OF WOMEN IN OHIO.

[Correspondence of The Tribune.]

SALEM, Columbiana Co., Ohio, Sunday, April 21.

DEAR FRIEND GREELEY: The call of a Convention to frame a new Constitution for the State of Ohio has aroused the Buckeye women to an effort to secure for themselves equal rights with men in making and administering the laws by which they are to be governed. A Convention, composed of four or five hundred of the sex, has just closed a session of two days in this place. Men took no part whatever in the proceedings, but attended in great numbers as spectators. The whole subject of Woman's position, political, social and intellectual, was pretty thoroughly canvassed, and that, too, with an ability which would have done no discredit to elevated and enlighted minds of the other sex. Among those most active in the proceedings were many who occupy the highest plane of society in our Western villages—women of vigorous and cultivated minds, and distinguished for all the virtues pertaining to the sex. The call was address-ed to the Women of Ohio, and excited a very deep interest in many portions of the State. From this and the adjoining counties the attendance was large, and many came from a distance. The Convention excited an intense interest in this village and vicinity. Little else was talked about or thought of while it was in session. The large meeting-house of Friends (Hicksites), in which all the sessions save one were held, was crowded much of the time to overflowing—the women occupying one part, and the men, scarcely less numerous, the other.

The Convention first assembled on the morning of the 19th, in the Second Baptist Church. Mrs. Emily Robinson, of Marlboro, on behalf of the Committee of Arrangements, called it to order, when MARY ANNE W. JOHNSON, of Salem, was appointed President *pro tem* and SARAH COATES, of Marlboro', (for merly of Chester Co., Pa.), Secretary *pro tem*.

A Committee consisting of MARTHA J. TILDEN of Akron (wife of the former Member of Congress from that District), EMILY ROBINSON of Marlbo'. J. ELIZABETH JONES and JANE TRESCOTT of Salem, and JOSEPHINE GRIFFING of Litchfield, nominated the permament officers of the Convention, and they were appointed as follows:

President—Miss BETSEY M. COWLES of Canton.

Vice-Presidents—LYDIA B. IRISH of New-Lisbon, HARRIETT J. WEAVER of Salem, and RANA DOTA of Akron.

Secretaries—CAROLINE STANTON, of Salem, ANN ELIZA LEE of Randolph, and SALLIE B. GOVE of Salem.

Business Committee—MARY ANNE W. JOHNSON of Salem, JOSEPHINE GRIFFING of Litchfield, MARY H. STANTON of Salem, ESTHER ANNE LUKENS of New-Garden, CORDELIA SMALLEY of Randolph, EMILY ROBINSON of Marlboro', J. E. JONES of Salem.

The Convention having been duly organized, a letter was read from LUCRETIA MOTT of Philadelphia, a copy of which I send you. The Discourse of Mrs. MOTT in reply to Richard H. Dana's Lecture on Woman, was also read by J. E. Jones, and was listened to with the deepest interest by the crowded auditory.

Letters were subsequently read from LYDIA JANE PIERSON, Editor of the *Lancaster* (Pa.) *Literary Gazette*, MERCY L. HOLMES of Selma, LUCY STONE of West-Brookfield, Mass. (a graduate of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute, and a lady of fine talents), A. BROOKE of Oakland, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON of Seneca Falls, N. Y. (wife of Henry B. Stanton, Esq. and daughter of Judge Cady of Johnstown), EMMA STEER of Cadiz, RUTH DUGDALE of Selma, SARAH PUGH of Philadelphia, FRANCES D. GAGE of M'Connellsville (the 'Aunt Fanny' of Mrs. Swisshelm's Visiter), Mrs. R. M. M. SANFORD of Cuyahoga Falls (Editor of *The True Kindred*), ELIZABETH WILSON of Cadiz (author of the recent work entitled 'A Scriptural View of Woman's Rights and Duties'), and HARRIETT N. TORREY of Parkman. These letters were all very good—some of them first-rate. I send you those of Mr. PIERSON, Mrs. STANTON, Mrs. MOTT, Miss STONE, and Miss PUGH. I think you will find them worth copying, and that the readers of *The Tribune*, or at least many thousands of them, will peruse them with deep interest.

J. ELIZABETH JONES delivered a written Address, marked by great clearness and strength of argument and eloquence of style. She traversed the whole question, stating the legal disabilities to which women are subjected, the suffering endured by multitudes for want of adequate remuneration for their labor, &c., and contending stoutly for the entire and perfect equality of her sex. She was listened to with breathless attention by a crowded auditory, on whose minds her arguments and appeals evidently made a deep impression. The Address is to be published. The rest of the speaking was extemporaneous, and was generally very pithy and sensible, if not eloquent. Among those who spoke were ANNE CLARKE of Deerfield, JANE and RACHEL PRESCOTT of Salem, JANE and SARAH PAXSON of Marlboro', RANA DOTA of Akron, JOSEPHINE GRIFFING of Litchfield, MARY A. W. JOHNSON of Salem, SARAH COATES and HANNAH WILEMAN of Marlboro'.

The resolutions adopted by the Convention are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS.

Whereas, all men are created equal, and endowed with certain God given rights, and all just Governments are derived from the consent of the governed; and whereas, the doctrine that 'man shall pursue his own substantial happiness,' is acknowledged by the highest authority to be the great precept of Nature; and whereas, this doctrine is not local, but universal, being dictated by God himself; therefore

1. *Resolved*, That all laws contrary to these fundamental principles, or in conflict with this great precept of Nature, are of no binding obligation, not being founded in equity or justice.

2. *Resolved*, That the prohibition of Woman from participating in the enactment of the laws by which she is governed is a direct violation of this precept of nature, as she is thereby prevented from occupying that position which duty points out, and from pursuing her own substantial happiness by acting up to her conscientious convictions; and that all statutes and constitutional provisions which sanction this prohibition, are null and void.

3. *Resolved*, That all rights are *human* rights, and pertain to human beings, without distinction of sex; therefore justice demands that all laws shall be made, not for man, nor for woman, but for mankind, and that the same legal protection be afforded to the one sex as to the other.

4. *Resolved*, That the servile submission and quiet indifference of the Women of this country in relation to the unequal and oppressive laws by which they are governed, are the fruit either of ignorance or degradation, both resulting legitimately from the action of those laws.

5. *Resolved*, That the evils arising from the present social, civil and religious condition of women proclaim to them, in language not to be misunderstood, that not only their *own* welfare, but the highest good of the race demands of them, as an imperative duty, that they should secure to themselves the Elective Franchise.

6. *Resolved*, That in those laws which confer on Man the power to control the property and person of Woman, and to remove from her at will the children of her affection, we recognize only a modified code of the slave plantation; and that thus we are brought more nearly in sympathy with the suffering slave, who is despoiled of all his rights.

7. *Resolved*, That we, as human beings, are entitled to claim and exercise all the rights that belong by nature to any member of the human family.

8. *Resolved*, That all distinctions between men and women in regard to social, literary, pecuniary, religious or political customs and institutions, based on a distinction of sex, are contrary to the laws of Nature, unjust, and destructive to the purity, elevation and progress in knowledge and goodness of the great human family, and ought to be at once and forever abolished.

9. *Resolved*, That the practice of holding women amenable to a different standard of propriety and morality from that to which men are held amenable, is unjust and unnatural, and highly detrimental to domestic and social virtue and happiness.

10. *Resolved*, That so long as women oppose the examination of the position and duties of Woman in all the various relations of human life, they do but enhance and perpetuate their own degradation, and put far off the day when social laws and customs shall recognize them as equally entitled with men to a voice in creating and administering the governmental and religious institutions under which they live.

11. *Resolved*, That the political history of woman demonstrates that tyranny the most degrading, cruel and unrelenting, can be exercised and produced, the same in effect under a mild and republican form of government as by an hereditary despotism.

12. *Resolved*, That while we deprecate thus earnestly the *political* oppression of woman, we see in her social condition, the regard in which she is held as a moral and intellectual being, the fundamental cause of that oppression.

13. *Resolved*, That among the principal causes of such social condition, we regard the public sentiment which withholds from her all, or almost all, lucrative employment and enlarged spheres of labor.

14. *Resolved*, That in the difficulties thus cast in the way of her self-support, and in her consequent *dependence* upon man, we see the greatest influence at work in imparting to her that tone of character which causes her to be regarded as the 'weaker vessel.'

15. *Resolved*, That as all things work in a circle, such places as we have spoken of will only be opened to woman as she shows, by the cultivation of her own mind and the force of her own character, that she is capable of filling, and that herself must prove her courage by calmly putting forth her hand to grasp them, in disregard of the usages which have hitherto withheld them from her.

16. *Resolved*, That we regard those women who content themselves with an idle, aimless life, as involved in the guilt as well as the suffering of their own oppression, and that we hold those who go forth into the world, in the face of the frowns and the sneers of the public, to fill large spheres of labor, as the truest preachers of the cause of woman's rights.

17. *Whereas*, One class of society dooms woman to a life of drudgery, and another to one of dependence and frivolity; and whereas, the education she generally receives is calculated to cultivate vanity and dependence; therefore *Resolved*, That the prevalent ideas of female education are in perfect harmony with the position allotted her by the laws and usages of society.

18. *Resolved*, That the education of woman should be in accordance with her responsibility in life, that she may acquire that self-reliance and true dignity so essential to the proper fulfillment of the important duties devolving upon her.

19. *Resolved*, That as woman is not permitted to hold office nor have any voice in the Government, she should not be compelled to pay taxes out of her scanty wages to support men who get eight dollars a day for *taking* the right to *themselves* to enact laws *for* her.

20. *Resolved*, That we, the women of Ohio, will hereafter meet annually in convention, to consider and adopt measures for the removal of the various disabilities, political, social, religious, legal and pecuniary, to which women as a class are subjected, and from which result so much misery, degradation and crime.

21. *Resolved*, That we will appoint a Committee to attend to all the interests of this cause, and to fix upon the time and place of holding our next Convention.

22. *Resolved*, That we will personally interest ourselves in promoting the circulation of those periodicals which endeavor to promote this great cause of Justice and Equal Rights.

The following Memorial to the Constitutional Convention was also adopted:

THE MEMORIAL *of the Ohio Women's Convention, held in Salem, Columbiana Co., April* 19 *and* 20, 1850, *respectfully represents:*

We believe the whole theory of the Common Law in relation to woman is unjust and degrading, tending to reduce her to a level with the slave, depriving her of political existence, and forming a positive exception to the great doctrine of equality, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

In the language of Walker, in his 'Introduction to American Law,' 'Women have no part nor lot in the formation or administration of the Government. They cannot vote nor hold office. They are required to contribute their share, by way of taxes, to the support of the Government, but are allowed no voice in its direction. They are amenable to the laws when made, but are allowed no share in making them. This language, when applied to males, would be the exact definition of political slavery.' Is it just or wise that woman, in the largest and professedly the freest and most enlightened Republic on the globe, in the middle of the Nineteenth Century, should be thus degraded?

We would especially direct the attention of the Convention to the legal condition of married women. Not being represented in those bodies from which emenate the laws to which they are obliged to submit, they are protected neither in person nor property. 'The merging of woman's name in that of her husband is emblematical of the fate of all her legal rights. At the marriage altar the law divests her of all distinct individuality. Blackstone says, the very being of the legal existence of the woman is suspended during marriage, or at least is incorporated or consolidated into that of her husband.' Legally she ceases to exist, and becomes emphatically a new creation, and is ever after denied the dignity of a rational and accountable being. The husband is allowed to take possession of her estates, as the law has proclaimed her legally dead. All that she has becomes legally his, and he can collect and dispose of the profits of her labor, without her consent, as he thinks fit; and she can own nothing, have nothing which is not regarded by the law as belonging to her husband. Over her person he has a more limited power. Still, if he render her life intolerable, so that she is forced to leave him, he has the power to retain her children, and to 'seize and bring her back, for he has a right to her society, which he may enforce either against herself or any other person who detains her.'—(Walker's Introduction p. 229.)

Woman, being thus subject to the control and dependent on the will of man, looses her self-dependence, and no human being can be deprived of this without a sense of degradation. The law should sustain and protect all who come under its sway, and not create a state of dependence and depression in any human being. The laws should not make woman a mere pensioner on the bounty of her husband, thus enslaving her will, and degrading her to a condition of absolute dependence.

Believing that woman does not suffer alone when subjected to oppressive and unequal laws, but that whatever affects injuriously her interests is subversive of the highest good of the race, we earnestly request that, in the new Constitution you are about to form for the State of Ohio, Women shall be secured not only the rights of suffrage, but all the political and legal rights that are guaranteed to men.

BETSY M. COWLES, President.

ANN ELIZA LEE,
CAROLINE STANTON,
SALLIE B. GOVE, } Secretaries.

An excellent Address to the Women of Ohio from the pen of Mrs. ROBINSON, of Malboro, was adopted and will be published.

The question of sending a delegation of Women to Columbus, to secure a hearing before the Constitutional Convention, was considered, but the difficulty of obtaining suitable speakers in the State prevented the adoption of the measure. Since the adjournment of the Convention, I understand that an effort is to be made to procure the services of LUCRETIA MOTT of Philadelphia and LUCY STONE of Massachusetts to argue the question at Columbus, if it shall be found practicable to obtain a hearing.

I will only add, that the Convention was in all respects admirably managed. The President (Principal of the Union School at Canton) performed her duties with a dignity worthy of the presiding officer of any deliberative assembly. OBSERVER.

LETTER FROM MRS. LYDIA JANE PIERSON.

LANCASTER, Pa., Friday, April 12.

To the Members of the Convention:

LADIES: Most earnestly do I thank you for the kind confidence and good will with which you have invited me to be present and take part in the proceedings of an Equal Rights Convention, to be held at Salem, Ohio, on the 19th and 20th of the current month. Joyfully would I hasten to be present with you, but am prevented by insurmountable obstacles from profiting by your wisdom or lending my insignificant aid in the good cause you have in hand.

No person can be more deeply impressed than am with the utterly wrong basis on which Society at present rests. To use the words of Scripture: 'The foundations of the earth are out of course.' You express a fear that I am not as radical as you would wish. I fancy that no person sees more plainly, or feels more deeply, the wrongs which the strong inflict upon the weak, then my humble self. I have in my own person suffered almost every wrong and sorrow. I am sometimes accused of speaking with bitterness; but I have fed on bitter bread and waters of Marah. How should I speak honeyed words?

Yet as a reformer my views differ from those of some, being, as I fancy, more 'radical,' as I would strike at the root of the evil.

I would not dictate to any person, much less to a Society; yet in my view, 'knowledge is power.' Education of itself will make us free; ignorance is not fit to be trusted with freedom. If the slave States would educate their young blacks, give them trades, and suffer them, at a certain age, to go out free, they would do their duty; but if these slaves in their present ignorance and degradation, unused as they are to provide for their own wants, were to-day set at liberty, it would, in my opinion, be a deed to be deplored. A few of them would make a living, but the great mass would prove incapable of providing for themselves, and the poor houses and jails would be full of them, from one end of the land to the other. Yet we do not understand why a black skin should prevent a man from being a man, any more than a black eye. We are sure that education is able to raise the black to an intellectual level with his white brother, and we believe the time is near when the 'slave will be free from his master.' But we are constitutionally averse to all violent measures, even to bring about good ends. We would qualify men for freedom, and then it will not be possible to retain them in bondage. Slaveholders have opposed the education of their 'human cattle' (impious assumption!) from this conviction; and for the same reason man has opposed the intellectual progress of woman. But look at the results. The slaveholder's children are debased by domestic intercourse with his 'cattle,' and the whole race of man is inferior in consequence of the incompetence of mothers, who form the young mind and effect the only indellible impressions upon the intellect and heart. Thus man's idiotic pride and injustice to woman reacts upon himself, and the degradation of a part of the population debases a whole country. Right education can alone eradicate these evils.

Do not be offended, but I am constrained to utter my belief that the great majority of my own sex are at present incapable of doing service to their country or honor to themselves in public stations. When we consider the deplorable ignorance of everything but household drudgery of the great mass, and the miserable tinsel that is palmed off as education on the most favored, we see only here and there one whose God-given intellect, with a supernatural power, has overleaped all obstacles and caught a living coal from the altar of science. These would honor their country in any station; but for every one such there are thousands of poor, weak, imbecile, helpless things, no more fit to touch the chariot of Liberty than a leper was to carry the ark of God's covenant.

But I insist that woman posesses naturally mental capacities every way equal to those of man. And I will never relinquish this belief until, having enjoyed all advantages in common with him, she shall fail to equal him in attainment. The gates of science have always been kept shut against her by popular prejudice, and the fashionable schools for girls have been infinitely worse than none, for it has been their effort to smother, under affectation and morbid delicacy, the little common sense that survived the restraints of the nursery. After being taught etiquette, the hypocritical conventionalities of fashion, a little music, and a few French phrases—all by note—they are turned out to use their accomplishments for the purpose for which they have been taught to value them, viz: to win a husband and secure a settlement.—They are married at seventeen and soon become mothers, are consigned to oblivion or kept alive by a round of vanity and dissipation. This picture, however humiliating, is a true representation. Such women are fit for nothing but to die as they have lived.

We sometimes hear men advocating the cause of woman, talk of elevating and educating her, as if she must receive all things at his hand. We only ask to be allowed 'to enjoy the common gifts of heaven.' We have no patience with the phrenologist who attempts to establish woman's inferiority by pretending a difference of formation in the heads of males and females. That such teaching is libelous, any person can convince himself by noticing the heads of those around him; especially let him go into a school of young children. We know that he will find no one distinguishing, general characteristic. This assumption of phrenology has made the whole science false and contemptible in my estimation. Women have heads as large, in proportion to the size of their persons, as men have; and until it shall be proved that the ox is more intelligent than the dog, because he is larger, we will never believe that man is wiser than woman because he has more bulk of flesh, blood and bones.

The evils of Society are attributable to false systems of education. Boys are miserably neglected in the domestic training, and girls in the scholastic.—If the boys received the same lessons of gentleness, submission, self-denial, endurance, truth, and purity, which are deemed indispensable to girls, and girls were permitted to attend Schools and Colleges, as boys do, until they are twenty-four or five, we should need no Conventions for revolution or reform; and I very much fear that, until education shall have done her work, no reformatory efforts will greatly benefit Society.

The greatest blame of woman, and the strongest obstacle to her elevation, is the deplorable manner of early marriages. Very few girls attain their growth, fewer still maturity of constitution and intellect, before they are made wives and mothers. Every man knows that such a course must of necessity deteriorate any breed of domestic animals; and does he suppose himself an exception to the immutable laws of nature? Woman, however she may appear so, is not mature earlier than man; and in all marriages, the nearer of an age the parties are, the greater is their chance of happiness, prosperity, long life, and healthy good-tempered children. Early marriages, more than any other cause, prevent the development of the female intellect. The reasons that support this truth are obvious. Women will never be qualified to fill the position for which her Creator endowed and designed her, until, rejecting early marriage, she shall devote to study the same season of her life that is appropriated to the same end by man. Suppose that boys uniformly left school at the age of seventeen, or eighteen at farthest, just as the intellect becomes capable of understanding and grasping learning, and were then immediately devoted to some all-engrossing business, how many learned men would the world have to boast? We are bold to say, not one more than it has now of women.

I would not, like revolutionary France, depose a tyrant, educated to the throne, and substitute ignorance, drunk with a newly-acquired power, and the emancipated slave, in whose hand freedom is like a sword in the grasp of a madman. I would not revolutionize, but reform.

As regards the right of suffrage, and all Government rights, I do not understand by what rule woman can be excluded. She is amenable to the laws in her own person: she is, in common with her family, subject to all the ills consequent upon a wrong administration of public affairs. If she has property, she is subject to all taxes, whether levied for purposes of war or otherwise; and she is certainly as much interested in the future welfare of her children and of posterity as their other parent can be. As to qualifications, even now the great mass of women are as capable of forming a right judgment as the great mass of men. We know that all elections are carried by the rabble, who, without knowledge or principle, follow such leaders as are able to secure their confidence; and the vote of a drunken fool counts against that of the most able statesman. It is hardly worth while, then, to plead incompetent understanding.

At all events, woman could not be led by the potent bridle of demagoguism, which is a free dispenser of intoxicating drinks, which drowns the consciousness of right in the muddy heads of half our sovereign people, who, because they are allowed to say Ay to the scheme of some plotting villain, imagine they exercise some voice in the Government.

We see no power able to reform all abuses, and place mankind on a level, but the great expositor of God's truth, Education.

Thus, my dear friends, I have given you a hasty sketch of my opinions upon these vital subjects; and I earnestly pray that your Convention may be guided in its action by the spirit of Divine Wisdom, and be made instrumental in opening the way to universal emancipation, and thus hastening the millenium of Virtue, Brotherhood and Peace.

Once more tendering my thanks for your invitation and expressions of kindness and confidence, I write myself, Your co-worker,

LYDIA JANE PIERSON.

LETTER FROM MRS. E. C. STANTON.

SENECA FALLS, N. Y., Sunday, April 7.

DEAR MARY ANNE: How rejoiced I am to hear that the women of Ohio have called a Convention preparatory to the remodeling of their State Constitution. The remodeling of a Constitution, in the nineteenth century, speaks of Progress, of greater Freedom, and of more enlarged views of Human Rights and Duties. It is fitting, that at such a time, woman, who has so long been the victim of ignorance and injustice, should at length throw off the trammels of a false education, stand upright, and with dignity and earnestness manifest a deep and serious interest in the laws which are to govern her and her country. It needs no argument to teach woman that she is interested in the laws which govern her. Suffering has taught her that already. It is important, now that a change is proposed, that she speak, and loudly too. Having decided to petition for a redress of grievances, the question is, *for what shall you first petition?* For the exercise of your right to the Elective Franchise:—nothing short of this.

The grant to you of this right will secure all others, and the granting of every other right while this is denied is a mockery. For instance: What is the right to property without the right to protect it? The enjoyment of that right to-day is no security that it will be continued to-morrow, so long as it is granted to us as a favor and not claimed by us as a right. Woman must exersise her right to the Elective Franchise, and have her own Representatives in our National Councils, for two great reasons:

1. Men cannot represent us. They are so thoroughly educated into the belief that woman's nature is altogether different from their own, that they have no idea that she can be governed by the same laws of mind as themselves. So far from viewing us like themselves, they seem, from their legislation, to consider us their moral and intellectual antipodes; for whatever law they find good for themselves, they forthwith pass its opposite for us, and express the most profound astonishment if we manifest the least dissatisfaction. For example: Our forefathers, *full of righteous indignation*, pitched King George, his subjects, and his tea-chest, all into the sea, because, forsooth, they were forced to pay taxes without being represented in the British Government. "Taxation without Representation" was the text for many a hot debate in the forests of the New World, and for many an eloquent oration in the Parliament of the Old. Yet, in framing a new Government, they have taken from us the very rights which they fought, and bled, and died to secure themselves. They have not only taxed us, but in many cases they strip us of all we inherit, the wages we earn, the children of our love; and for such grievances we have no redress in any Court of Justice this side of Heaven. They tax our property to build colleges, then pass a special law forbidding any woman to enter them. A married woman has no legal existence; she has no more absolute rights than a slave on a Southern plantation. She takes the name of her master, holds nothing, owns nothing, can bring no action in her own name; and the principle on which she and the slave are educated is the same. The slave is taught what is considered best for him to know—which is nothing; the woman is taught what is best for her to know—which is little more than nothing; man being the umpire in both cases. A woman cannot follow out the impulses of her own immortal mind in her sphere any farther than the slave can in his sphere. Civilly, socially and religiously, she is what man chooses her to be—nothing more nor less—and such is the slave. It is impossible for us to convince man that we think and feel exactly as he does, that we have the same sense of right and justice, the same love of freedom and independence. Some men regard us as devils, and some as angels; hence one class would shut us up in a certain sphere for fear of the evil WE might do, and the other for fear of the evil that *might be done to us*. Thus, except for the sentiment of the thing, for all the good it does us we might as well be thought the one as the other. But we ourselves have to do with what *we are*, and what *we shall be*.

2. Man cannot legislate for us. Our statute-books and all past experience teach us this fact. His laws, where we are concerned, have been, without an exception, unjust, cruel and aggressive. Having denied our identity with himself, he has no data to go upon in judging of our wants and interests. If we are alike in our mental structure, then there is no reason why we should not have a voice in making the laws which govern us; but if we are not alike, then most certainly we must make laws for ourselves, for who else can understand what we need and desire? If it be admitted in this Government that all men and women are free and equal, then must we claim a place in our Senate Chambers and Houses of Representatives. But if, after all, it be found that even here we have classes and caste—not 'Lords and Commons,' but Lords and Women—then must we claim a lower House, where our Representatives can watch the passage of all bills affecting our own welfare or the good of our country. Had the women of this country had a voice in the Government, think you our National escutcheon would have been stained with the guilt of aggressive warfare upon such weak, defenceless nations as the Seminoles and Mexicans? Think you we should cherish and defend in the heart of our nation such a wholesale system of piracy, cruelty, licentiousness and ignorance as is our Slavery? Think you that relic of barbarism, the gallows, by which the wretched murderer is sent, with blood upon his soul, uncalled for, into the presence of his God, would be sustained by law? Verily no, or I mistake woman's heart, her instinctive love of Justice and Mercy and Truth.

Who questions woman's right to vote? We can show our credentials to the right of self-government—we get ours just where man got his—they are Heaven-descended, God-given. It is our duty to assert and reassert this right—to agitate, discuss and petition, until our political equality be fully recognized. Depend upon it this is the point to attack—the strong-hold of the fortress: *the one* woman will find most difficult to take—*the one* man will most reluctantly give up. Therefore, let us encamp right under its shadow—there spend all our time, strength, and *moral* ammunition, year after year, with perseverance, courage and decision. Let no sallies of wit or ridicule at our expense—no nonsense of woman's beauty, delicacy and refinement—no promise of gold and silver, bank stock, road-stock, or landed estates—seduce us from our position, until that one stronghold totters to the ground. This done, the rest will they surrender *at discretion*. Then comes equality in Church and State—in the family circle, and in all our social relations.

The cause of woman is onward. For our encouragement, let us take a review of what has occurred during the last few years. Not two years since, the women of New York had several conventions. Their meetings were well attended by both men and women, and the question of woman's true position fully and freely discussed. The proceedings of those meetings, and their declaration of sentiments, were all published, and scattered far and near. Before that time, the newspapers said but little on that subject. Immediately after, there was scarcely a newspaper in the Union that did not notice these conventions, and generally in a tone of ridicule. Now, you seldom take up a newspaper that has not something about woman: but the tone is changing—ridicule is giving way to reason. Our papers begin to see that this is no subject for mirth, but one for serious consideration. Our literature also is assuming a different tone. The heroine of our fashionable novel is now a being of spirit, of energy, of will, with a conscience, with high moral principle, great decision and self-reliance. Contrast Jane Eyre with any of Bulwer's, Scott's or Shakspeare's heroines, and how they all sink into the shade compared with that noble creation of a woman's genius. The January number of the *Westminster Review* contains an article on Woman, so liberal and radical, that I sometimes think it must have crept in there by some mistake. Our fashionable lecturers, too, are now, instead of the time-worn subjects of 'Catholicism,' 'The Crusaders,' 'St. Bernard,' and 'Thomas à Becket,' choosing Woman for their theme. True, they do not treat this new subject with much skill or philosophy; but enough for us that the great minds of this day are taking this direction. Mr. Dana of Boston, lectured on this subject in Philadelphia. Lucretia Mott followed him, and ably pointed out his sophistry and errors. She spoke to a large and fashionable audience, and gave general satisfaction. Dana was too sickly and sentimental for that meridian. The women of Massachusetts, ever the first in all moral movements, have sent, but a few weeks since, to their Legislature a petition demanding their right to vote and hold office in that State. Woman seems to be preparing herself for a higher and holier destiny. That same love of liberty which burned in the hearts of our sires, is now being kindled anew in the daughters of this proud Republic. From the present state of public sentiment, we have every reason to look hopefully into the future. I see a brighter, happier day yet to come. But woman must say how soon the dawn shall be, and whether the light shall first shine forth in the East or the West. By her own efforts the change must come. She must carve out her future destiny with her own right hand. If she have not the energy to secure for herself her true position, neither would she have the force or stability to maintain it if placed there by another. Farewell.

Yours, sincerely,
E. C. STANTON.

LETTER FROM SARAH PUGH.

"Lawrencian Villa is extremely beautiful; the grounds full of shrubbery and flowers, the splendid dairy, the green-houses and conservatories, four or five of them, appropriated to fruit and flowers and rare plants in large numbers—the whole displaying great taste and skill. *Mrs.* Lawrence's improvements are not completed; she is extending her shrubbery and walks. She is undoubtedly one of the most skilful cultivaters and florists in the country, (a country abounding with them) and carries off more prizes at the Horticultural Exhibitions than almost any one else. I am told Mr. Lawrence is an eminent surgeon in London, and the whole of the country place is under *Mrs.* Lawrence's management."—*Colman's Letters from Europe.*

DEAR FRIENDS: As I finished reading this paragraph, your letter inviting me to your Convention, to be held on the 19th inst. was handed me. I cannot, as I gladly would, be with you. That my mite may not be wanting in aid of the cause, taking the above extract for my 'text,' I would add as a 'commentary' that, according to the laws and usages of a large portion of Christendom, in the event of the death of Mr. Lawrence, Mrs. Lawrence, the one whose taste and skill has formed this elegant establishment, would be left by the 'Will' of Mr. Lawrence an income from a *part* of the estate, and the 'privilege of occupying during her natural life' two or three rooms in the large mansion, but powerless as a stranger in the beautiful demesne made valuable by her industry and skill! This is not 'supposing a case,' only in the application of it to Mrs. L. In this country, where, as a general rule, women take their full share of the labor and responsibility of a household, and thus by their *constant* assiduity contribute their full proportion to the means by which a comfortable competence is secured, do we not see the disposal of it assumed as a matter of right by the male partner of the firm?

That women contribute their full share in the building of an estate by *labor*—the only rightful mode—no one that is capable of taking an enlightened view of the prevailing condition of things will deny. True, she may not wield the axe nor guide the plow, braced by the invigorating air, for her's is the more wearisome task, and the one which requires the most skill, to attend to the complicated machinery within doors. She may not handle the awl nor the plane for "ten hours a day," with but a small tax upon the intellectual powers; but by her *perpetual* oversight and ever-varying labor, she makes one dollar two—or more.

This is one form of the many grievances to which women are subjected, all arising from the false assumption of their inferiority by Nature, and by the "Ordination of Providence." May your Convention aid in dispelling this delusion from the minds of men, but chiefly from the minds of women—for to themselves, in a great degree, is their degraded position owing. Rouse them to a belief in their natural equality, and a desire to sustain it by a cultivation of their noblest powers.

There is much that crowds on me for utterance, but there will be those among you who will be able to give a fuller and fitter expression to the thoughts that cluster around this all-important question, the "Rights and Duties of Woman"—her Rights equal to those of Man, she alone the judge of her Duties.

May your Convention hasten the day when these rights shall be acknowledged as equal to those of man, and independent of him, and when men and women shall equally co-operate for the good of all mankind. With great interest, your friend,

SARAH PUGH.

To the Ohio Convention of Women.
Philadelphia, 15*th April*, 1850.

LETTER FROM LUCRETIA MOTT.

To the "Women's Convention," to be held at Salem, Ohio, on the 19*th instant:*

The Call for this Convention, so numerously signed, is indeed gratifying, and gives hope of a large attendance. The letter of invitation was duly received, and I need scarcely say how gladly I would be present, if in my power. Engagements in another direction, as well as the difficulty of travel at this season of the year, will prevent my availing myself of so great a privilege.

You will not, however, be at a loss for speakers in your midst; for among the signers of the Call are the names of many whose hearts "believe unto righteousness;" out of their abundance, therefore, the mouth will make "confession unto salvation."

The wrongs of Women have too long slumbered. They now begin to cry for redress. Let them be clearly pointed out in your Convention; and then not *ask* as *favor*, but *demand* as *right*, that every civil and ecclesiastical obstacle be removed out of the way.

Rights are not dependent upon equality of mind. Nor do we admit inferiority; leaving that question to be settled by future developments, when a fair opportunity shall be given for the equal cultivation of the intellect, and the stronger powers of the mind shall be called into action.

If, in accordance with your Call, you ascertain "the bearing which the circumscribed sphere of woman has on the great political and social evils that curse and desolate the land," you will not have come together in vain.

"May you indeed "gain strength" by your "contest with difficulty." May the "whole armor of Right, Truth and Reason" be yours. Then will the influence of the Convention be felt in the assembled wisdom of *men*, which is to follow; and the good results, as well as your example, will ultimately rouse other States to action in this most important cause.

I herewith forward to you a Discourse on Woman, which, though brought out by local circumstances, may yet contain principles of universal application.

Wishing you every success in your noble effort, I am yours for Woman's redemption and consequent elevation, LUCRETIA MOTT.

Philadelphia, 4*th mo.* 13*th*, 1850.

LETTER FROM LUCY STONE.

To the Woman's Rights Covention:

DEAR FRIENDS:—The friends of human freedom in Massachussetts rejoice that a Woman's Rights Convention is to be held in Ohio. We hail it as a sign of progress, and deem it especially fitting that such a Convention should be held *now*, when a new State Constitution is to be formed. It is easier, when the Old is destroyed, to build the New right, than to right it *after* it is built.

The statute books of every State in the Union are disgraced by an article which limits the right to the elective franchise to "*male* citizens of twenty-one years of age and upwards" thus excluding one half the population of the country from all political influence, subjecting woman to laws in the making of which she has neither vote nor voice. The lowest drunkard may come up from his wallowing in the gutter, and, covered with filth, *reel* up to the ballot-box and deposit his vote, and his right to do so is not questioned. The meanest foreigner who comes to our shores, who cannot speak his mother tongue correctly, has secured for *him* the right of sufferage. The negro, crushed and degraded as if he were not a brother man—made the lowest of the low, even *he*, in *some* of the States, can vote; but woman, in every State, is plunged in a degradation lower than *his* lowest deep.

Woman is taxed, under laws made by those who profess to believe that taxation and representation are inseparable; while in the use and imposition of the taxes, as in representation, she is absolutely without influence. Should she hint that the profession and practice do not agree, she is gravely informed that "woman shouldn't talk politics." In most of the States, the married woman loses by her marriage the control of her person, and the right of property, and if she is a mother, the right to her children also; while she secures what the town paupers have—the right to be maintained.

The legal disabilities under which woman labor have no end. I will not attempt to enumerate them. Let the earnest woman who speak in your Convention enter into the detail of this question, nor stop to 'patch fig-leaves for the naked truth,' but, 'before all Israel and the sun,' expose the atrocity of the laws relative to woman, until the ears of those who hear shall tingle, and so that the men who meet in Convention to form the new Constitution for Ohio shall, for very shame's sake, make haste to put away the last remnant of the barbarism which your statute-book, (in common with those of the other States,) retains, in its inequality and injustice to woman. We know too well the stern reform spirit of those who have called this Woman's Rights Convention, to doubt for a moment that what can be done by you to secure equal rights for all will be done.

Massachusetts *ought* to have taken the lead in the work you are now doing; but if she choses to linger, let her young sister of the West set her a worthy example; and if

'The Pilgrim spirit is not dead,'

we'll pledge Massachusetts to follow her.

Yours, for Justice and Equal Rights
LUCY STONE.

Southampton, Mass. April 10, 1850.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE PROPHETIC DEW-DROP.—A delicate child, pale and prematurely wise, was complaining on a hot morning, that the poor dew-drops had been too hastily snatched away, and not allowed to glitter on the flowers like other happier dew-drops, that live the whole night through, and sparkle in the moonlight, and through the morning onwards to noonday. "The sun," said the child, "has chased them away with his heat, or swallowed them up in his wrath." Soon after came rain and a rainbow, whereupon his father pointed upwards. "See," said he, "there stand the dew-drops gloriously reset—a glittering jewellery—in the heavens; and the clownish foot tramples on them no more. By this, my child, thou art taught that what withers upon earth blooms again in heaven." Thus the father spoke, and knew not that he spoke prefiguring words; for soon after, the delicate child, with the morning brightness of his early wisdom, was exhaled, like a dew-drop, into heaven.—*Jean Paul Ritcher.*

——THE ARCTIC EXPEDITION.—There is in Liverpool another female clairvoyante, whose disclosures have already caused much sensation amongst a large number of individuals. We allude to a young woman in the service of Captain Hudson, of 5, Chesterfield street. Captain Hudson is well known in this town as a man of religious principle, of strict integrity, and as having been for many years connected with the Bethel Union. For some time past he has felt much interest in, and paid much attention to, mesmerism, especially to its higher range of phenomena. The girl in question is very poor and uneducated, and she had, moreover, an affection of the arm, which prevented her from using it in the acquisition of a livelihood. This infirmity was removed, through mesmeric agency, by Captain Hudson. She was then taken into his service; and, having experimented upon her, he has found her to be not only a susceptible mesmeric subject, but one who has developed, to a very considerable extent, the power of clairvoyance. On the 9th instant, in consequence of a request communicated to him from Lady Franklin, Captain Hudson "put the girl to sleep," as the mesmerists style the operation of throwing the patient into that state which only resembles sleep in some few of its phenomena; and in that state the following disclosures were made as to the arctic expedition:

"Did you say," inquired the operator, "that Sir John Franklin is dead?" And to this and other questions, the clairvoyante responded: "That cannot be, for I see him; poor fellow! he looks sad and wearied, and not so well as when I was last here. (The girl had previously been sent in search of the missing expedition.) He says he is poorly and tired, and almost worn out with hopes deferred; but his men console him and behave nobly. God never made a path through these desolate wastes. What could induce him to try to break through these icy mountains? He frequently thinks of the folly of his daring to do so. Such thoughts humble him, and make him sad and hopeless; yet he thinks he will succeed in returning to England. He is right. He will return in six months and three or four days. The ships are at a great distance from each other. They look dirty and battered. They have no sails set. They (the seaman) are cutting the ice before them